DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 765 IR 006 369

TITLE	Research Libraries and the Bicentennial. Minutes of the Meeting (89th, Alexandria, Virginia, October 20-21, 1976).
INSTITUTION	Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Oct 76
NOTE	110p.; For related document, see IR 006 370
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($5.00 per issue)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Annual Reports; Committees; *Conference Reports; *Library Associations; *Research Libraries; Speeches; University Libraries
IDENTIFIERS	*Academic Libraries

ABSTRACT

The minutes of the October 21-22, 1976 meeting of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) include the texts of two presentations: "Our Cultural Heritage: Whence Salvation?" by Louis B. Wright and "The Uses of the Past" by Gordon N. Ray. Reports given during the business meeting include those from the Librarian of Congress, the ARL executive director, joint ARL/CRL committee on a national periodical lending library, the committee on preservation of research library materials, and the Office of Management Studies, as well as a special report from the NCES Library Services Branch and remarks by both the outgoing president and the president-elect. Recommendations on criteria for ARL membership, final report of the ARL task force--NEH Research Tools program, the sixth annual report of Office of University Library Management Studies and a list of ARL officers, board of directors, committees, and membership conclude the report. (JPF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

- ED158765

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RESEARCH LIBRARIES AND THE BICENTENNIAL

Minutes of the Eighty-ninth Meeting

October 20-21, 1976 Alexandria, Virginia

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Suzanne Frankie

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

IR000369

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Opening	1
OUR CULTURAL HERITAGE: WHENCE SALVATION? Louis B. Wright	2
THE USES OF THE PAST Gordon N. Ray	16
BUSINESS MEETING	
Report from the Librarian of Congress	30
Election of Board Members	33
Report of the Executive Director	34
Joint Report on ARL Membership Criteria	41
Report of Joint ARL/CRL Committee on a National Periodicals Lending Library	43
Report of the Committee on Interlibrary Loan	45
Report of the Committee on Preservation	47
Report of the Joint ARL/ACRL Committee on University Library Standards	51
Report of the Office of Management Studies	52
Special Report: NCES Library Services Branch	56
Report of the President	58
APPENDICES	
A. Joint Recommendations on Criteria for ARL Membership	60
B. Final Report of the ARL Task Force - NEH Research Tools Program	62
C. Office of University Library Management Studies Sixth Annual Report	70
D. Attendance at 89th Meeting	92
E. Association of Research Libraries Officers, Board of Directors, Committees and Task Forces	99
F. Membership of Association of Research Libraries	103

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Minutes of the 89th Meeting

Virginia P. Whitney, presiding

The Eighty-ninth Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries was held at the Ramada Inn in Alexandria, Virginia on October 21, 1976.

President Virginia Whitney opened the meeting by welcoming and introducing new and alternate representatives attending their first ARL meeting and guests of the Association.

President Whitney then turned the program over to Edward Lathem, who introduced the morning's speakers.

OUR CULTURAL HERITAGE: WHENCE SALVATION?

by Louis B. Wright

Introduction

EDWARD LATHEM: When a man has had for so long so distinguished a career as has Louis Wright, there is a temptation, for someone who has the assignment of presenting him to an audience, to engage in an extended chronicle of his achievements. In Louis Wright's case this would involve recounting accomplishments as journalist and teacher, as an historian, as author and editor, as library research specialist, and of course as Director for two decades of the Folger Shakespeare Library -- those things among many, many others. However, Doctor Wright has come to us today not to be introduced, but to speak; and it is with a good deal of both pleasure and pride that I present him to you, forthwith, on the subject "Our Cultural Heritage: Whence Salvation?" Ladies and gentlemen, the Vice Chairman of the Council on Library Resources, Louis B. Wright.

* * * *

LOUIS B. WRIGHT: It is difficult to talk to professional members of one's own trade, because anything said will tend to sound like a cliché. Someone is bound to have thought of it before and, perhaps, given it better expression. I hope you will forgive me if I beat old straw and create unnecessary dust. It would be much easier to talk about libraries to a lay audience, who would be less knowledgeable. I can't help remembering, in my present circumstances, a writer who was once addressing a popular audience in Colorado. Afterward, an old rancher came up. "You still writing books?" he inquired. "Must be nice work. You kin do it all in the shade. But I reckon it's hard to make all them lines in a book come out even."

We librarians are sometimes misjudged by the public. How many of us have heard some nice old lady comment that she envied us because we could "read all those interesting books." I have sometimes felt like replying in Thomas Hobbes' famous aphorism: "If I had read as many books as other men, I would know as little." But perhaps a comment by old Sawney Webb, founder of the famous school at Bell Buckle, Tennessee, would be more apt. When a local Philistine objected to the school's insistence on esoteric study, even of Latin, and declared that most boys would be better off if the school taught them to milk a cow, Sawney retorted: "Yes, a boy ought to learn to milk. But I would rather he learned to do something that a calf can't beat him at."

We librarians have to deal with a two-pronged problem: we must emphasize to our own brethren that research libraries have an obligation to do more than merely provide utilitarian services (almost as mundane as milking a cow), and we must also convince our constituencies (including academic administrations) that research libraries are guardians of our cultural heritage. These goals may sound platitudinous, but I can assure you that they are ill-understood, in and out of the trade.

For the past two decades university librarians have been troubled by mounting problems. On the one hand they faced an ever-increasing demand from faculties and graduate students for research materials of infinite variety, great cost, and even greater bulk. On the other hand they had to obtain money from reluctant administrations or from generous donors for needed acquisitions. Then they have had to contrive space to house a flood of periodicals, books, pamphlets, manuscripts, documents (government and private), films, photostats, photographs, music and oral-history records, and any miscellaneous lore that some enthusiast felt impelled to recommend -- including, in a few instances, archaeological artifacts. (I once knew a library which had to fight off an influential trustee's proffered gift of a well-preserved alligator and a stuffed bear. We all know the problem: research libraries must protect themselves from becoming warehouses of oddities).

For the past ten years the Association of Research Libraries and related organizations have devoted much thought to finding a solution for dealing with the deluge of relevant material that students and their professors require. A few years ago we naively believed that technology, in some mysterious fashion, would take care of the problem. Technology, to be sure, has been of immense help to libraries, but our basic problems remain unsolved. Nevertheless, we continue to hope. Somewhere Mark Twain commented that Americans, ever on the look-out for a good thing, are fascinated with science because "one gets such wholesale returns of conjecture out of such a trifling investment of fact." Someone else, however, observed that "science humiliates us by filling our houses with appliances smarter than we are." Librarians would gladly undergo incidental humiliation if their appliances would save them some recurrent anxieties.

Many years ago, Fremont Rider, one of the early worriers about library space, calculated that in the year 2040 the Yale Library, at its then annual rate of increase, would be required to house 200 million volumes on 6,000 miles of shelves. Its catalogue alone would require eighty acres of floor space. Other librarians also began to worry, and administrators saw an opportunity to demand retrenchment in book and library building budgets, lest an avalanche of books and documents bury them beyond discovery. As always in crisis, a few self-appointed prophets appeared, usually from departments of English, where professorial imaginations are wont to run untethered. Some of these prophets foretold the end of the conventional book. Out of the ether would come all we would need to know, whether of truth or beauty. Soon scientists, with imaginations equally vivid, assured us that we could preserve in computers all the information that mankind -- and womankind -- should know. Sitting at a console, Faustus would make blind Homer sing -- even call up the face that launched a thousand ships and burned the topless towers of Ilium. These were heady thoughts, and a few trustees, if not librarians themselves, began to believe that we could soon dispense with huge library buildings and curb the importunities of book-hungry faculties. Enveloped in a fog of words, frequently contradictory, we have been unable to grope our way to that technological haven.

To help find a solution, the Ford Foundation assisted in the creation of the Council on Library Resources. One of its avowed purposes was to foster the study of technological applications to libraries, and we have had some success. Not as much, I am sure, as the Ford Foundation hoped for. By subsidizing experimentation with both software and hardware (if I may use the jargon of the technological trade), the Council has aided libraries to apply a considerable number of useful scientific procedures. Perhaps one of the Council's greatest contributions has been negative. It has enabled libraries to show that many imaginative dreams of a decade ago are impractical and economically unfeasible now or in the foreseeable future.

It is unnecessary to remind this group of the manhours that members of the Association of Research Libraries, for more than a decade, have devoted to discussing the problems of collecting, housing, and disseminating information. Reading the reports of ARL conferences is a discouraging exercise because, for every concrete proposal, there appears to be an insuperable obstacle. Douglas Bryant, in a paper on "Development of Resources," stresses the desirability of specialization among libraries but concedes that significant specialization is unlikely "unless universities were prepared to specialize in particular fields of instruction and research -- a likelihood not, I believe, in immediate prospect." He does provide a brief obituary of "the final demise of the doctrine of self-sufficiency for research libraries."[1]

Ralph E. Ellsworth in a brief note on "Bibliographic Control" describes the bankrupting expense for any library that tries to acquire all available tools for storing, maintaining, and retrieving bibliographic information. After listing a wide variety of sources, including the Stonehenge-sized National Union Catalogue, in its hundreds of volumes, he concludes that "We can look forward to even greater advances if and when federal funds become available. Without them, an already unsatisfactory situation will become steadily worse."[2] This was written in 1970. Few if any gleams of light yet illuminate the dark picture.

Gordon Williams cites figures to show that in certain fields a quarter of the books acquired and retained in research libraries are used no oftener than once in a hundred years. He believes that an extension of the ideas that led to the creation of the Center for Research Libraries may promise some relief for participating research libraries. They could borrow rather than house books and documents not in constant or frequent use.[3]

The example of the British National Lending Library for Science and Technology, operating out of Boston Spa, is of continuing interest to ARL, which has recommended the study of the British scheme to the National Commission on Libraries and has contemplated some adaptation of the lending techniques. The potential for a single American lending library, especially for current periodical literature, has been clouded, however, by the uncertainties of the new copyright act and the sheer magnitude of such an undertaking in a country as large as the United States.

But there is no need to emphasize further the enormous difficulties

still facing research libraries. The problems, all too familiar to everyone here, have been the subject of your collective deliberations these many years.

We all agree that help from the government, from foundations, and from private sources must be forthcoming if research libraries, as we have known them, are to survive and function for the benefit of society. Research libraries are under enormous and continuing pressures to supply vast quantities and infinite varieties of information -- especially in the sciences. We have come to talk of the supply of information as if that is the sole function of research libraries. Because the ever-expanding fields of science now tax libraries to the verge of bankruptcy, it is small wonder that we have clasped computers to our bosoms. The mysteries of technology -- like the mysteries of religion -- are abstruse enough to provide a blind hope of salvation. We should not dream of evading our responsibilities of supplying information per se, but we should not forget that we also have other responsibilities.

Now, with your indulgence, I should like to turn to another aspect of our problem. Humanists do not tend to regard mere information as the be-all and the end-all of learning. A so-called humanist, stuffed to the bursting point with facts, can be an intolerable bore, a pedant, and a plague to be avoided. Genuine humanists look to libraries to furnish something more than the latest bibliographical item on a trivial subject better forgotten. Back in the days of the Great Depression we had a program to plow under certain crops to prevent over-production. Now we need a similar program to plow under scores of incipient Ph.D.s -- and the miserable manifestations of their labors -- to prevent libraries from being inundated with theses that are an abomination before the gods of learning. Would that the sham humanist could learn to make a living at some honest trade instead of carpentering pedantic books and articles.

Genuine humanists -- and they are not necessarily confined to professors in these disciplines -- expect research libraries to supply materials illuminating our cultural heritage, materials of esthetic and cultural value to stimulate the imagination and guide us to the wisdom of the ancients. "Where there is no [such] vision, the people perish."

That leads us to the book. In our zeal to mechanize learning, we seem at times to forget the value of the book as an economical conveyor, not only of information, but of intellectual stimulation and esthetic delight. Not every book, to be sure, but books discriminatingly chosen.

The book is a convenient and inexpensive storehouse of knowledge, easier to use than many more fashionable gadgets. A distinguished humanist has observed that, in addition to other virtues, "the book has merits as an information-storage-and-retrieval machine, that, strange to say, are not nowadays obvious to some people to whom they should be obvious: it is very compact and portable, does not have to be plugged into an electric outlet, and is user-paced (the reader turns the pages at his own speed). Random access is

available (you can flip back to any page you wish), and it can mix verbal and non-verbal information." Carried away with the characteristic American love of gadgetry, some scholars in the humanities have neglected the old-fashioned book, to wander after some technological will-o'-the-wisp that might save them the trouble of thinking.

As librarians, we will do our profession a disservice if, amidst our troubles, we forget to emphasize book collecting and the values that flow from it. Books stir an emotional, as well as an intellectual, response that few, if any, machines can arouse. If the public comes to regard libraries as mere warehouses of information, however useful, we shall lose influential portions of our constituency.

Since earliest times, western civilization has often regarded the book as a talisman of mystical powers. Over the door of the ancient Egyptian library at Thebes were carved these words: "Medicine for the soul." Librarians today cannot aspire to the prestige of Egyptian librarians, whose office was priestly and carried the designation of "keepers of wisdom."

The earliest book collectors in Western Europe were Greeks. Plato, Euripides, and Aristotle brought together prized libraries. The libraries of Hellenic Alexandria were the most famous in the ancient world. Mark Antony gave Cleopatra the great library of Pergamum, which he had taken as spoils of war, to replace a library destroyed in street fighting in Alexandria. Sulla captured Aristotle's library in Athens and brought it to Rome.

Our own debt to collectors, however, derives not from the Classical world, but from a long line of English booklovers who, beginning in the Sixteenth Century, brought together significant libraries, many of which were later sold and have enriched scores of American research libraries.

I like to think that perhaps there is something in the genes, beginning with Sir Thomas Bodley, that makes Anglo-Americans especially sensitive to book values. Few other people in modern times have been so eager to preserve books and make them available to a public capable of using them. A Nineteenth-Century collector, Frederick Locker-Lampson, commented in the preface to a catalogue of his library: "It is a good thing to read books, and it need not be a bad thing to write them. But it is a pious thing to preserve those that have been sometime written."[4] This last sentence gives a clue to the secret of the best English book collecting: the discriminating selection of old books that have been "sometime written" -- which have stood the test of time.

We cannot preserve everything, though some research librarians, influenced by faculty pressure, seem to think so. We must give more thought to discrimination. A lengthy colloquium in Boston on April 27 and 28, 1966, devoted its attention to the perennial problem of the future of research libraries. The flood of verbiage prompted Prof. Howard Mumford Jones, perhaps representing the "consumer interest" in libraries, to declare that he wished librarians

would forget the word "service" and make it harder for mediocrities to do what they fancy is "research."

Over the centuries, wise collectors have displayed a useful sense of discrimination that has been beneficial to research libraries. It may be heresy to say so, but the elimination of quantities of material is necessary to enable the scholar to encompass his subject and to prevent the library from being covered up in a lava flow of literary pumice. Many a scholar, slaving over the literary residue of the Sixteenth Century, has secretly wished to erect a monument to Henry VIII, who destroyed thousands of monastery books, and to John Warburton's cook, Betsy Baker, who lined her pie pans with pages from old plays.

The question of what to save and what to throw away is vexing librarians and archivists throughout the world. Some, as I have suggested, would save everything, which promises disaster. Others would make a choice, which might be equally disastrous. Whatever they do will be displeasing to someone. But everything cannot find a place for preservation. That much shelf space is not available anywhere -- and microphotography is merely bibliographical aspirin to reduce the fever temporarily. We can be grateful to the judgment of collectors who, for better or worse, solved the problem for us in the past.

Afflicted with abundance, even knowledgeable research librarians are likely to forget that the bibliographical center of gravity has shifted from Europe to the United States in the lifetime of the American Library Association. A century and a half ago, no scholar could write a book on this continent that required any depth of investigation in books or historical documents. Thanks to our inheritance of collections painstakingly gathered by English collectors, American libraries are now so well supplied that Europeans often come to the United States to study their own history and literature. This development has occurred not without some agonized cries from abroad. Europeans have complained about the drain of literary and historical treasures from the Old World to the New. When a member of a visiting group of English scholars once groused that certain books in the Folger Library "ought never to have been allowed out of the country," he was silenced by a wise colleague. "If these books had remained in some English country house, you would never have had access to them," he declared, "or they might just have rotted away. Here they are preserved for scholars from any country."

The most constructive book collecting in this country has occurred in the past hundred years, much of it in the Twentieth Century. Wealthy Americans, like the Medici of Florence, became patrons of learning. Rich collectors, having spent millions of dollars buying books, dedicated them to public use by donating their collections to universities and private libraries. We must give full credit to donors for the rapid increase in rare books and manuscripts in our academic institutions.

Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Princeton, Indiana, Illinois, the University of California (both UCLA and Berkeley) -- to mention merely the most significant academic research libraries -- rival the best on the other side of the Atlantic. Possession of this literary and historical hoard imposes upon us an obligation to the whole learned world. Of course we have no obligation to turn Tom, Dick, and Harry loose to pillage and spoil rare collections that they have no genuine vocation to use. But no university library can afford to refuse access to these resources, gathered from the ends of the earth, to scholars capable of using them intelligently.

The riches of these research libraries provide an opportunity for advancement of learning that did not exist a few generations ago. Sometimes I wonder, however, whether the multiplicity of source material ensures better or wiser works from current authors. One scans the historical horizon in vain for a modern equivalent of Francis Parkman or William H. Prescott. Nevertheless, we must assume that from under our bibliographical hoard a genius from time to time will creep -- like the Monarch butterfly from its dull gray chrysalis.

How humanists can make the best use of the enormous resources of the great research libraries is a problem for them and for us. Scientists have a less complex approach. Their data are more finite, more easily codified, and more susceptible of revelation by machines. Frequently the poor humanist, with vaguer objectives, finds himself floundering in the Slough of Despond, without a paddle or pole to push him through the morass of preserved data that our greatest research libraries feel impelled to preserve.

In the future, perhaps, specialized <u>privately endowed</u> libraries will have to shoulder heavier responsibilities for research in humanistic fields. Already they are meeting a significant need. Their opportunities -- and their obligations -- will increase as the great academic libraries find themselves saddled with multiplying non-humanistic demands. Perhaps my own professional background makes me emphasize unduly the importance of these private libraries, but I do not think so. Necessarily, they will become oases in which humanistic scholars increasingly will find refuge and refreshment from the stress and difficulties of Academia.

The privately endowed libraries, which concentrate their interests around rare book collections bequeathed by their founders and added to over the years from their inherited funds, are specialized institutions. Consequently, they can devote their energies and resources to fewer fields. They can also gather productive scholars on their staffs to devote a portion of their time to humanistic learning.

In the old days, the British Museum, the Bodleian, the Cambridge University Library, and other libraries in both Great Britain and the United States could free scholarly members of their staffs to carry on research and write books of value to humanistic learning. Unhappily, administrative responsibilities and limited budgets now restrict such activities in most of the great libraries.

Yet, the privately endowed institutions can still foster such work. We sometimes forget that these institutions are peculiar to the United States. Although a few private libraries open to scholars exist elsewhere, the bequest to the public of large private collections, with adequate endowments to enable them to become institutions of learning, is an American phenomenon. This is a tribute to the perspicacity and the patriotism of donors who in an earlier age would have been called "malefactors of great wealth" or "robber barons." The public owes them a debt of gratitude. Humanists, who sometimes spend the largesse of the donors in maligning them, should be especially grateful. All the great libraries of the nation have benefitted from the extraordinary generosity of philanthropists who saw in rare books and manuscripts a means of self-satisfaction and of public service. Some philanthropists have preferred to see their collections, even though remaining independent, attached -- however tenuously -- to a university. Characteristic of such benefactions are the William Andrews Clark Library of the University of California at Los Angeles; the Lilly Library, Indiana University; the William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan; the James Ford Bell Library, University of Minnesota; and, ultimately, the Wilmarth Lewis Eighteenth-Century and Horace Walpole Library, Yale.

The independent research libraries, endowed as completely separate institutions, to my knowledge are duplicated nowhere else in the world. The Morgan Library, New York, owner of a great collection of Renaissance and other manuscripts, is also rich in later rarities. At the opposite pole, historically, is a much newer institution, the Eleutherian Mills-Hagley Foundation Library at Wilmington, Delaware, a remarkable collection of documents and books describing the growth of American industry in the Nineteenth Century.

Three independent pioneers in the utilization of their resources for the advancement of learning in the humanities are the Newberry Library, Chicago; the Henry E. Huntington Library, San Marino, California; and the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C. Although my present audience is familiar with these three institutions, it will not be amiss to remind the professional public of their contributions -- and their potential for further aid in our common cause.

The oldest of these three libraries is the Newberry, a composite of many collections. It has sufficient private endowment to continue to grow, to hold scholarly conferences, and to offer limited financial help to scholars in the form of grants-in-aid. Its collections are diverse, ranging from Old French to American railroad history. It has one of the most extensive collections in the United States on the history of printing, and owns perhaps the best collection in the Western Hemisphere on primitive languages. (During World War II its materials on the languages and dialects of some of the Pacific islands proved invaluable.) It even has a remarkable collection of Gypsies. The Newberry is a great general library with significant strength in special fields of language, literature, and history.

The second of the great endowed private libraries to develop as an active research institution was the Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery. It opened its doors in 1927, and since that time it has established an international reputation as a haven for scholars from all the world. The Huntington owes its existence to the avidity for books of a millionaire railway and real estate magnate, Henry Edwards Huntington, and to the wisdom and foresight of his intellectual advisor, Dr. George Ellery Hale, then head of the Mount Wilson Observatory in Pasadena, California. Huntington bought libraries as avidly as he acquired railways and land. At the end of World War I, he bought up great libraries wholesale, regardless of price, and consolidated his holdings. In the 1920's he moved his library from New York to California. Under the influence of humanistic counsellors, Huntington was convinced that it was not enough to own some of the world's finest books; the books must be given significant utility.

Because Huntington had developed an interest in the backgrounds of Anglo-American civilization, he set up an endowment providing for the continuance of his library as a research institute for the study of this phase of the history of civilization. He left the bulk of a great fortune to perpetuate his library and to provide for a research staff and for international fellowships.

Huntington also collected an art gallery of Eighteenth-Century paintings, with some of the most famous portraits by Gainsborough, Lawrence, Raeburn, and Reynolds. It is said that these silken men and women of the English aristocracy, looking so substantial and respectable, typified Huntington's notion of the solid basis of the civilization that America inherited from England. Be that as it may, it is certain that he lavished a great deal of enthusiasm and money in his last years on gathering books and manuscripts from the Middle Ages to the end of the Nineteenth Century in order to illuminate Anglo-American culture. This enormous collection, rich in English and American literature and history, became a public institution after Huntington's death in 1927. The endowment is sufficient to allow the Library to grow and to provide generous fellowships. Since its opening hundreds of scholars from the United States and Europe have enjoyed its bounty. It also has a publication program of distinction.

The third of the great endowed libraries of America, supporting research and subsidizing scholars, is the Folger Library. It owes its foundation to the enthusiasm for Shakespeare acquired at Amherst College by Henry Clay Folger, later to become head of the Standard Oil Company of New York. As an undergraduate student, Folger received an almost religious conversion to literature. Although his personal interest was largely confined to Shakespeare, he realized that the dramatist could not be studied in a vacuum; hence, he collected the historical materials needed for an understanding of the whole Tudor and Stuart periods. Gradually the collection grew in magnitude and scope. When Folger died in 1930. he left his books and his fortune to the Trustees of Amherst

College, to found and administer a research library in Washington next door to the Library of Congress. He chose this site because he realized that inevitably Washington would be one of the most important research centers in the world.

The fame of Folger's Shakespeare collection, together with the appearance in the formal title of the institution of the name Shakespeare, has tended to make the general public believe that the Folger Library has little interest in anything except Shakespeare. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Actually, the Folger Library is one of the most effective places in the Western Hemisphere for the study of British civilization -- all aspects of it -- for the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. It set itself the goal of gathering the materials that influenced the lives and thoughts of the English-speaking peoples in the Tudor and Stuart periods, or roughly from 1476 to 1715. This was a period as significant for American as for British history, for the foundations of American civilization were laid in these centuries, and whatever latter-day Americans may be in blood stock, the fundamental concepts of their civilization -- their language, manners, morals, religion, law, and habits of thought -- came out of Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England. Americans have as great a concern with Tudor and Stuart history as Englishmen, for they share the same cultural heritage. Not Anglophilism but a sensible interest in American history prompts the Folger Library to begin with 1476, the year when Caxton set up his printing press at Westminster.

The privately endowed libraries are not rolling in money, but their endowments are sufficient for orderly growth, modest subsidizing of scholars, and useful publication programs -- providing they are not persuaded to squander their funds on non-library functions. It is a tragedy for the world of learning when ill-advised trustees and administrators induce any of these libraries to waste resources upon undertakings for which they have no vocation, no experience, and inadequate skills.

It is currently fashionable to demand that all sorts of institutions "do something" for the inner cities, provide entertainment for the ghetto, and lead the down-trodden into the light. Sentimental ignorance has caused some libraries to limit their usefulness to learning while they salved their consciences by washing the feet of the poor. They ought to remember the example of Sir Thomas Bodley, who steadfastly turned a deaf ear to the admonitions of his contemporaries to use his money to help poor widows and orphans. Think how much the library he founded has done, even for the poor, and ponder how little would have been accomplished by money that he might have spent on charitable causes for momentary relief.

Let me emphasize: The privately endowed libraries are equipped to assume more of our common burden, and they must not evade their duties or excuse themselves by indulging in miscellaneous activities that are not focused upon specific library problems.

By long and circuitous detour, we return now to the major problems facing the Association of Research Libraries. How can we arouse the general public to the desperate needs of all research libraries? How can we induce government agencies to direct funds to libraries, even at the expense of other educational endeavors? In some fashion we need to get before the American public facts and proposals that have epitomized themes of ARL discussions for so long that we are weary of the sound of our own voices in expressing them -- and we dread another batch of memoranda treating them. But, even yet, government officials and the public remain largely unaware of what the research libraries have done for them.

At the risk of tedious repetition, let me summarize much that I have already said. I would like to repeat some of the things that the ARL has previously discussed and recommended, and to make a few further suggestions.

As a result of the quality of its research libraries, the United States in the Twentieth Century has made incredible progress in all fields of learning. The United States could not have become a leader in the world today if these libraries had not accumulated and organized the sources of knowledge essential to our development.

A bit of historical perspective might dramatize for the public the utility of research libraries. When the barbarians swept over Western Europe in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries and wiped out civilizations bequeathed by Greece and Rome, much of the Classic inheritance that determines our present-day culture might have been lost if Arabian scholars and collectors of the Middle East had not preserved priceless manuscripts in their libraries. When the Moors invaded Spain, scholarly bibliophiles among them brought along books which later transmitted to Christians a knowledge of Greek science, medicine, and letters. But the great libraries of the Middle East, which had served as reservoirs of knowledge, were themselves destroyed, along with their keepers and students, by Genghis Khan and his Mongol hordes. Between 1218 and 1220 he sacked and ruined such places of learning as Samarkand, Bokhara, and Merv. The Arabic civilization which the libraries of these centers represented never recovered from the Mongol devastation. The greatest civilizations have depended upon learning stored in libraries, and without them they perish.

Never in the history of mankind, however, has stored information been so critically important as it is today, not only to progress but even to survival. The powers that will prevail in the future will be those with the most effective armories of knowledge -- scientific, historical, and humanistic. Adequate libraries are required for the dissemination of such knowledge. We need to reiterate constantly things we have been saying to one another. For example, the public needs to know that during the first half of the Twentieth Century the United States surpassed all other countries in the development of superb research libraries. Donors, legislatures, and alumni gave generously of both books and money to enable research institutions to gather collections in every field of significant learning -- the natural sciences, the social

sciences, and the humanities. Almost no important subject failed to attract the attention of some collector or donor.

But now American research libraries are facing a crisis. Their very effectiveness has created demands that threaten to swamp them. Scientists, social workers, historical scholars, writers, humanists of every type are descending upon the research libraries in ever-increasing numbers with requests for source material and information infinite in variety. The problem of sheer service imposed by sweeping demands in one of enormous proportions, and not even aids provided by computers and other technological developments are adequate.

The explosion of knowledge, paralleled by the population explosion, has also created an all-but-insuperable problem. In former ages a few encyclopedic books might incorporate the essential knowledge required by scholars and scientists. That day is centuries past. Every learned discipline may have a vast literature of printed books, specialized periodicals, statistical reports, abstracts, graphs, pictorial reports, even sound tracks and records, not to mention storage banks of information in computerized forms. The acquisition of all this material is costly, time consuming, and space devouring. Furthermore, it must be inventoried, catalogued, or otherwise made accessible to its potential users, which also requires trained personnel and great expenditures of money. No longer can even the richest university research library hope to be complete and self-sufficient in all fields of knowledge. The Association of Research Libraries and related organizations are searching for means of dealing with this problem of paramount importance to the nation's welfare.

The position of the United States as world leader forces upon it responsibilities that even a few decades ago it might have neglected. For that reason alone it requires a national system of research libraries that can ensure excellence in stored knowledge that can be retrieved for use on demand.

No single library any longer can hope to provide all the services and materials that scientists and scholars require. A division of responsibility is necessary and inevitable. Some system must be devised for the sharing of resources, as well as the sharing of services and the sharing of costs. The achievement of this goal will require a viable plan and financial support from the Federal Government.

Research libraries in the past have followed a policy of "building to strength" in their collection of needed source material. For example, if a library already had respectable collections on the archaeology of Middle America, Colonial American history, or Renaissance literature, it sought to add to the strength of those fields. Or if its university had a distinguished research professor working on theories of constitutional government, it would collect everything in history and political science bearing on this topic. Or the university might have active graduate departments of anthropology, English literature, economics, or some other field, and would buy the source material

that those professors required for their graduate students. Thus libraries grew in strength in certain fields of knowledge.

In almost every section of the United States, research libraries have developed effective bodies of material in a variety of fields. In many cases they duplicate each other's efforts, which may be a good thing up to a point, for it may be desirable to have more than one repository of needed information. But unwarranted duplication cannot continue indefinitely, because of the scarcity of source material, the flood of publication, and the lack of money. A way must be found to rationalize on a national scale the building of collections.

Research libraries have made encouraging progress in sharing material through interlibrary loans, photocopies, and permissions to scholars from other institutions to use their reading rooms. A useful beginning has been made in sharing the cost of certain services -- cataloguing, for example. Soon it should no longer be necessary for every research library to repeat endlessly the individual classification and cataloguing of every book that goes on its shelves. One institution can catalogue the book and share the information with the others. Union catalogues listing sources of scarce materials, such as manuscripts, are being made available. But much more needs to be done -- and can be accomplished -- if funds are available. The aim is to ensure excellence in a national system of knowledge, through the shared facilities of research libraries.

If the Association of Research Libraries, for example, could select the fifty research libraries with the most important retrospective scholarly collections in the United States -- or whatever number seems desirable -- and then induce them to develop a plan of coordinated development, continued growth, and mutual sharing of responsibilities for service to the nation, the United States might soon have a national resource unexcelled in the world. Such a plan would have to be supported by continuing federal grants of substantial proportions.

The need is now imperative to incorporate the largest and most effective research libraries in such a plan, so as to ensure continued excellence, as well as adequate help to the other less affluent and more hard-pressed libraries throughout the country. The large research libraries, with federal support, could then guarantee (perhaps through advanced technology) to supply services and materials that are not now available to scientists and scholars working in smaller libraries or, indeed, to most individuals working in any library. The smaller and newer libraries would not feel pressed then to attempt the expensive duplication of these important older collections. They could concentrate on current needs.

More important still is the need for new methods and policies for collecting, storing, and making available the increasing quantities of data

of all sorts — printed books, technical journals, abstracts, manuscripts, graphic art, charts, oral reports, etc. -- that are rapidly accumulating in every field of knowledge. The preservation of all of these documents of our civilization, documents essential not merely for posterity but for the conduct of life at the moment, is beyond the capacity of any single library. Even if the Library of Congress, for example, had many times its present facilities, it would not be able to carry the whole burden. Nor would such vast repositories as those at Harvard, Yale, or the University of Chicago be equal to the task.

Not merely is the preservation of this material required, but the dissemination of the information contained therein is an essential obligation of research libraries if our society is going to survive in health. The welfare of the United States -- indeed, the welfare of mankind -- is at stake.

Genghis Khan laid waste one great civilization by burning its libraries and destroying its essential records. Ignorance of the problem and neglect can be as disastrous as marauding Mongols. We cannot allow our civilization to be smothered by indifference to the crisis threatening our research libraries. How can our libraries pick up the challenge? Will the Federal Government be foresighted enough to bear its share of the responsibility? The public must be informed -- informed by us as best we can -- and it must make its voice heard. Congress must realize the importance of libraries to the public welfare. Somehow it must get the message. Would that every legislator could remember John Milton's words in Areopagitica asserting that "books are not absolutely dead things but do contain a potency of life in them to be as active as that soul whose progeny they are." (The rest of the quotation is too well known to need repeating.) But let us too not forget that books contain the life blood of master spirits, and no machine will replace them.

****

NOTES

1. Douglas W. Bryant, "Problems of Research Libraries: Development of Resources," ACLS Newsletter, XXII (January, 1971), pp. 6-7.

2. Ralph E. Ellsworth, "Bibliographic Control," Ibid., p. 13.

3. Gordon R. Williams, "Physical Access to Library Materials," Ibid., p. 18.

4. Quoted by William Y. Fletcher, English Book Collectors (London, 1902), p. viii.

THE USES OF THE PAST

by Gordon N. Ray

Introduction

EDWARD LATHEM: It was a decade ago that Gordon Ray eloquently keynoted the eighty-fifth annual conference of the American Library Association in New York City. Now, as the Association of Research Libraries at this meeting, held in the Bicentennial year of American independence, undertakes to make acknowledgement of an historic national milestone, he does us the honor of joining us here in Alexandria and of speaking to us this morning. Doctor Ray is a man who has attained distinction as a teacher and as an educational administrator. He is a man who has produced models of scholarship as editor, author, and compiler; his works have richly merited, and enthusiastically received, the accolade "monumental." He is a man whose concern for, and varied services to, the interests of libraries and learning are as outstanding as they are extensive. Ladies and gentlemen, to address us on "The Uses of the Past," the very distinguished President of the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, Gordon N. Ray.

* * * *

GORDON N. RAY: My talk today will be a plea for more attention to the past, particularly on the part of trustees and officers of philanthropic foundations. I know that making this plea to the present audience is like playing tennis with the net down, but I can at least assure you that the talk is being given elsewhere to groups in greater need of enlightenment. The reasons for the neglect of the past by foundations are not far to seek. Foundation trustees are usually lawyers or business executives immersed in the problems of practical life. There is no prescribed program of training for foundation officials, and they are cut to no particular pattern, but they too tend to come from the world of affairs, with some leavening of academics who are often social scientists. Consequently, foundations are usually managed by people whose aim is to affect the current scene in some immediate, tangible way. They typically justify foundations by describing them as agents of change, which provide the "cutting edge" of society's thrust for improvement and whose grants are the "seed money" that prepare the way for innovation. This philosophy of social engineering hardly makes for retrospective contemplation. Instead, the prevailing habit of thought regarding the past among foundation officials approaches that achieved by the scientist and aspired to by the social scientist. Alfred North Whitehead once remarked that "before a discipline can become a science, it must first lose its memory," and Sir Peter Medewar has expanded his axiom in the following way:

> A scientist's present thoughts and actions are of necessity shaped by what others have done and thought before him; they

> are a wavefront of a continuous secular process in which The Past does not have a dignified independent existence of its own. Scientific understanding is the integral of a curve of learning; science therefore in some sense comprehends its history within itself.[1]

There is another habit of thought, however, which not only takes it for granted that we should maintain the past in "a dignified independent existence of its own," but assumes that we have much to gain by constantly exploring the past and, indeed, by learning after a fashion to live in it. This perspective is the end product of liberal education in its traditional sense; it has its base in the humanities; and its aim is culture. The terms "liberal education," "the humanities," and "culture" may seem faded and old-fashioned today, but they were once words of power. An English critic wrote more than a hundred years ago:

> When men have not some great pursuit, they abandon culture when they leave school, and (as a distinguished living poet said to me in a letter) 'content themselves with the current enlightenment of the epoch.'[2]

At any rate, this is the opposition that I should like you to keep in mind in considering what follows: does "the current enlightenment of the epoch" suffice for mankind's well-being, or should the past continue to be accorded "a dignified independent existence of its own"?

Since my argument centers on the humanities in their retrospective aspect, I'd better begin by stating what I include in this term. Their cornerstones are history, literature, philosophy, religion, and the ancient, medieval, and modern languages. They are distinct from the arts, yet the organized study of the past products of the arts is a central province of the humanities, and areas like art history and musicology are consequently humanistic disciplines. Moreover, such subjects as geography, anthropology, political science, sociology, economics, law, and education can all be viewed from a humanistic perspective, as indeed can science itself. So, Oscar Lewis was a humanist as well as a geographer, just as Mr. Robert Merton is a humanist as well as a sociologist and Dr. Lewis Thomas is a humanist as well as a scientist. As Sainte-Beuve wrote, "all that is open to general comprehension and interests the human spirit belongs by right to literature." After all this, it should hardly be necessary to stipulate, as it might in another context, that when I use the term "humanist," I mean a practitioner of the humanities in line of descent from Erasmus and Sir Thomas More, not a dogmatic atheist.

The humanities are supported in the modern world by a vast system which includes not only colleges and universities, but also libraries, museums, and learned societies, as well as a significant segment of the publishing

industry -- the whole apparatus by which knowledge of the past is achieved, analyzed, set in order, and made available. This apparatus is currently in some disarray. College and university presidents, museum and library directors, officers of learned societies, and scholarly publishers are all sending up distress signals. That they need assistance is undeniable, as I shall try to show. Yet, at the outset I must also be candid enough to note that in historical perspective their present expectations may well be exaggerated. My familiar acquaintance with the humanities in America goes back to 1932, when I entered Indiana University. During the intervening period, support for the humanities has increased by an order of magnitude. Even over the past six or seven years what they have experienced is not so much a falling off as a status quo ante or "steady state" condition, in which their disappointment has arisen from expectations of continued growth that were perhaps unwarranted. Our learned world remains a privileged, even a pampered society, which takes for granted services and opportunities which would have seemed marvellous forty years ago. We need to strike a balance between the hopelessness of the mid-1930's and the euphoria of the mid-1960's, with a view to concentrating moderate additional support in essential areas. This is a task in which foundations can be uniquely useful.

II

The credo of liberal education has been stated many times, but never better than by John Henry Newman. His central propositions may be summarized as follows: 1) "Knowledge is capable of being its own end"; indeed, "there is a Knowledge which is desirable, though nothing come of it, as being of itself a treasure, and a sufficient remuneration of years of hard labour." 2) The aim of liberal education is the formation of a habit of mind lasting through life which is marked by "the power of viewing many things at once as one whole, of referring them severally to their true place in the universal system, of understanding their respective values, and determining their mutual dependence."[3]

Even with today's vocational emphasis this faith still sustains most of our best students, and not merely those in the humanities. Indeed, it is almost a prerequisite for fine work in the world of learning. Over the last few years we have heard many expressions of surprise, and even indignation, from hard-headed university administrators, because the sharp decline in jobs for new humanities Ph.D.'s has not been accompanied by an equally sharp decline in graduate enrollment. After all, they point out, the artificial prop of draft avoidance disappeared some time ago. But consider once more the precedent of the 1930's. Students persisted in taking doctorates in English, history, and philosophy throughout that dark period, even though virtually no teaching jobs existed. A good many young men and women were convinced then, as they are today, that there is "a Knowledge which is desirable, though nothing come of it, as being of itself a treasure."

I should make it clear that I am speaking of liberal education in a general sense, not as the end product of formal courses in a college or university. Indeed, liberal education is largely self-education; it results from the studies we undertake because, at the time, they are more absorbing than any other activity. How does one in practice acquire an intuitive sense of man's social, psychological, and moral life, and thereby achieve some understanding of the human condition? In part by firsthand experience, no doubt, but this is a slow and confusing process. Current information offered by newspapers, magazines, television, and radio is an extensive but superficial and repetitive supplement to experience. The systematizations of such information proposed by social scientists are inconclusive, to use no harsher term. Contemporary works of art (whether they be novels, poems, plays, paintings, photographs, or films) can make a profounder contribution, since art, in its way, may be truer than any factual record. But with regard to understanding the human condition, our chief resource remains as always the inexhaustible heritage of the past, not merely as set down in history and biography, but also as preserved in those classics in which the mind of man has found its finest expression: his great revisitable achievements in literature, painting, music, and the other arts. Just as one euphemism for death is "joining the majority," so most of the great books were written in the past, and most interesting men and women and most significant events now belong to history. To limit one's horizon to the contemporary scene is to live as an intellectual shut-in. Here is the testimony of a fellow foundation officer, Mr. Harold Howe, on the way in which access to the past can add to one's awareness of life.

> Is there anything wrong with people pursuing more education just to satisfy their curiosity even though they may not need it on the job? What's the matter with intellectual hobbies created and nourished by education? I have an amateurish interest in the 19th Century poets. I can quote yards of their verse; I waste a fair amount of time reading it; I can't think of any use for it at all in any of the numerous jobs I have held. I happened to pick up this avocation from a marvellous old gentleman named Chauncy B. Tinker, whose course I took at college, and I continue to find it a pleasant addition to my several windows on the world.[4]

It may be urged that the benefits I have so far claimed for familiarity with the past operate chiefly with respect to the individual's own development. His experience of self-fulfillment makes life more agreeable to him, and he is a more interesting person. But how does this self-education contribute to his usefulness as a citizen? Above all, I would say, through the flexibility and maturity to which it leads, to his understanding that there are no final solutions to human problems, only sensible choices among alternatives. At the very least a dimension has been added to his outlook. He knows

that there is a provinciality of time as well as of place. By studying the past he comes to think in terms of the long-time continuity of life. In his Agricultural Origins and Dispersals, a magisterial review of what mankind has done with the plants and animals among which it lives, Carl Sauer points out that

> Our civilization still rests, and will continue to rest, on the discoveries made by peoples for the most part unknown to history. Historic man has added no plant or animal of major importance to the domesticated forms on which he depends.... We remain a part of the organic world, and as we intervene more and more decisively to change the balance and nature of life, we have also more need to know, by retrospective study, the responsibilities and hazards of our present and our prospects as lords of creation.

Changing the focus from pre-history to the Twentieth Century, it may be noted that the problems of Belfast and South Boston, of Cyprus and Beirut, cannot be comprehended outside of their historical context. No one can begin to appraise the situation in these places unless he knows how the patterns of the past circumscribe possible lines of action in the present.

Then, the exploration of the past can also encourage the development of a disinterested habit of thought in general, a generous and enlightened open-mindedness. Much of what is written about the present is either disguised or open propaganda. We are apt to regard our columnists and investigative reporters, for example, as if they were guard dogs, and prize them for their effectiveness in leaping at the jugular. But what is needed in dealing wisely with human affairs is not partisan certainty, but a capacity for weighing probabilities. This is what Justice Frankfurter had in mind when he wrote that "the mark of a truly civilized man is confidence in the strength and security to be derived from an inquiring mind." Moreover, it is through choices based on objective inquiry one becomes an individual, and by encouraging individuality our society can best resist what Mr. Norman Mailer has called "the oncoming hegemony of the technological person."[6] Every day brings new evidence of how radically the capacity for independent, creative thought is being curtailed by the sort of dehumanized training now regarded as appropriate for positions in the bureaucracies of government and of business.

Throughout my argument I have advocated a detached and relaxed approach to the past. Of course one forms strong allegiances during one's explorations, but the experience that results from the very process of immersion in the past has its own value. As Joachim du Bellay, author of the Defense et illustration de la langue française, wrote four centuries ago, "Heureux qui, comme Ulysse, a fait un beau voyage." Through dedication to some aspect of historical study -- and to my mind the process counts for more than the specific subject -- one can gradually achieve what might be called "the

freedom of the past," in the sense that worthy strangers used to be given the freedom of a city (that is to say, the rights and privileges of citizenship pertaining thereto. Admission to the "freedom of the past" on these terms can lead to a feeling for the recurring patterns of human behavior and thereby an intuitive perception of the possibilities and limitations of human life that is attainable in no other way. Nor should I omit another bonus in this sort of attitude towards the past. It offers an unfailing alternative to the insistent, mind-devouring trivia of the mass media. When you read a real book, you have the assurance -- which is not easily achieved in a society where entertainment and even information are increasingly linked to advertising -- that your attention has not been bought and paid for.

There are certainly more people in our time than ever before who enjoy the kind of familiar access to the past that I have described. Yet, there also appears to be more resistance than ever before to going through the self-education needed to achieve this access. The uninitiated have always felt that much reading is a weariness of the flesh. There is a lithograph by Gavarni, for example, which shows a bedraggled loafer gazing at a second-hand bookstall on the banks of the Seine. He is saying, with supreme contempt, "If I knew how to read, I wouldn't read old books like those." On a more sophisticated plane, people of a certain temperament have always felt that concern for the past was the mark of the antiquarian, a characteristic of those content to exist on the margin of life. To such unbelievers the apparatus mentioned earlier, for preserving and renewing humanistic knowledge, seems a vast, miscellaneous anthill of activity, depressing to contemplate.

No doubt it is in part to counter such an attitude, in themselves as well as in others, that some scholars insist on seeing the past as an extension of the present and on employing it primarily as an arsenal from which to draw weapons for use on today's battlegrounds. This was the guiding motive of radical critics in the 1930's and again in the 1960's. What they conceived to be the social and political necessities of their own time dictated their choice of historical subjects to study and teach, as well as their view of these subjects. Their work abundantly illustrates the maxim that for the politically motivated the best way to handle the past is to misinterpret it. Another sort of polemical aim lay behind the "great tradition" set forth by F. R. Leavis, the chief defender of the humanities against C. P. Snow's advocacy of science, in the famous debate of the early 1960's over the "two cultures." It was Dr. Leavis's dubious achievement to reduce the endless variety and profusion of English literature to a handful of poets and novelists who for him best demonstrated the ideals to which he wanted human nature and society to conform.

This tendency to see the past through the present has a disturbing currency, particularly among the young. Last year the authors of a study

sponsored by the Organization of American Historians deplored the increasing prevalence of "presentism," as they called it -- that is to say, an exclusive preoccupation with current events taken out of their historical context.[7] Teachers of literature are conscious of the same tendency, intensified in their field by a special heritage from the 1960's. In an essay significantly entitled "After Turmoil, After Torpor," Mr. Irving Howe reported:

> Even with the best of our students one senses more and more a phenomenon I would call the "pastness of the past," how the accumulating historical distinctiveness of our lives seems to drive a wedge between ourselves and our culture. Insofar, for example, as English literature rests on norms, premises, beliefs, and even memories of the Christian-Classical tradition, we may suppose that a reader who has grown up in our largely post-Christian culture will find himself increasingly tone-deaf to the works of the past.[8]

Our society needs a breathing space in which to overcome the discontinuities induced by the troubles of the last decade. There is a current rash of works predicting the end of culture -- practically every one of which, as a critic has noted, is "a book in search of a magazine article." This will pass, but time is required to re-establish intellectual authority and to restore the distinction between the serious and the frivolous esteem of mankind, which used to afford some protection to learning. Keeping humanists and their institutions viable during this period is an urgent and difficult task to which a high priority should be assigned.

III

If the humanities are to be supported in a democracy, there is an initial obligation to show that humanists and their institutions so order and present the past that it is of useful service to the public generally. This obligation was often ignored in earlier years, when enlightened patrons, moved by a spirit of noblesse oblige, provided cultural institutions with the financial support that they required. The amenities possible under such a system were substantial, and one relinquishes them with reluctance; but except for a few strategically situated institutions, basic reliance on the support of private individuals is no longer possible. The hard questions of those holding the purse strings of philanthropic or governmental organizations -- managers, bureaucrats, and legislators -- now have to be answered; and though the case to be made is a strong one, it is not easily presented in the sort of concrete way that such persons find convincing.

The humanities stand for quality and superior accomplishment. The humanist examines the past with a view to determining what from it continues to deserve active attention. For every book, picture, or musical score that he proposes for study, he leaves a thousand on the shelves or in storage. Those chosen works, moreover, have to be approached on their own terms

if they are to be fully understood and appreciated, and such an approach presupposes both knowledge and sophistication. This equipment is not something with which an individual is born, and yet without it the humanities are only marginally accessible.

Further, the possession of such background knowledge is apt to put the humanist in a difficult position with regard to the great public. The scientist's special knowledge is so esoteric that the average man or woman feels no uneasiness about not possessing it. The humanist's enhanced understanding, on the other hand, is a deepening of comprehension about things that concern the average man and woman as human beings. They have their own perceptions about these things, and they are understandably reluctant to grant the humanist the kind of authority that they willingly concede to the scientist. When the humanist sets out to enlighten them, they may attribute to him a supercilious, holier-than-thou attitude which usually is not there. Yet, taste based on special training is a good part of what the humanist has to offer. When a disgruntled member of an audience addressed by Mr. Saul Bellow complained about one of his judgments, "That's only your opinion," he replied, "What do you want? Parings from my fingernails?"

I don't wish to appear mystical, or to ask you to go into a trance to get my meaning, but at this point an act of faith in the humanities is called for. The sort of knowledge and taste necessary to their full appreciation is likely to remain the possession of a relatively small group of highly trained people, yet this group is the leaven that leavens the whole loaf. Without it even the partial comprehension of the great public would not be possible. Moreover, it may be hoped that, with the expansion of education and leisure, through the passage of time, a larger proportion of the public will achieve more complete appreciation. Here one may cite the evidence of Mr. John Canaday's valedictory article, after seventeen years as art critic with the New York Times. Maintaining that "What we were calling a cultural boom in 1959 has become in 1976 a deep-rooted cultural growth that has yet to come into full flower," he affirmed his belief in "a kind of cultural osmosis by which the deep pleasure experienced by a small portion of the public is symptomatic of an increased capacity for pleasure that has seeped into the subconsciousness of the many."[9]

I had planned to avoid all mention of America's Bicentennial, a topic concerning which there would seem to be little more to be said in October of 1976, yet its evidence regarding the possible uses of the past is too striking to omit. Certainly, American humanists and their institutions were not backward in celebrating this anniversary. There were some efforts that made their impression on the general public and at the same time pleased the experts: "The Adams Chronicles" on television, for example, and Mr. Page Smith's A New Age Now Begins: A People's History of the American Revolution. But for the most part successful Bicentennial celebrations seemed to find either a small, specially prepared audience or a large, undifferentiated

audience. Nearly all of our great museums and libraries mounted exhibitions in which their notable historical treasures were splendidly presented and recorded for posterity in superb catalogues. For example, the exhibits at the Smithsonian Institution, fondly called the "nation's attic," included "Abroad in America: Visitors to the New Nation, 1776 - 1914" at the National Portrait Gallery; "The Eye of Thomas Jefferson" at the National Gallery of Art; "America as Art" at the National Collection of Fine Arts; and "A Nation of Nations" and "1876: A Centennial Exhibition," both mounted by the Museum of History and Technology. Indeed, the exhibitions shown throughout the country were accomplishments of which any nation could be proud, but attendance at them ranged, for the most part, from moderate to meagre. What did catch the attention of the great public were spectacles devised to mark the occasion: the Queen's visit, "the tall ships" sailing up the Hudson, fifty marching bands in Philadelphia on the Fourth of July, and so on. As for the mass media, "show business" took over. Their most insistent and obvious Bicentennial contributions came in the form of one-minute spots publicizing minor personalities, apparently recruited chiefly from the entertainment world. ("I am So-and-so. Two hundred years ago today ..., etc. I am So-and-so.") These did not constitute a major cultural advance.

IV

We may pass now from the value of the past to the individual and society to the apparatus by which the study of the past is kept alive. Perhaps we don't sufficiently realize what a new thing it is in human history to have at our service such extensive and effective machinery for exploring and reporting upon the past. May I offer a comparison drawn from my own experience? As a combat intelligence and fighter director officer aboard the aircraft carrier Belleau Wood in 1943 and 1944 it was one of my duties to master the successive operation orders received during the United States Navy's island-hopping campaign in the Pacific. Though the background data in these documents were prepared by experts from our best universities, who had full access to the resources of the Library of Congress, the information provided about the Gilbert and Marshall Islands, Truk, Saipan, Guam, Okinawa, and the rest was not greatly in advance of what was available to Captain Cook in the Eighteenth Century. Today encyclopaedic data are on file about all these islands, as they are about every other conceivable subject. This fact is constantly brought home to me through my job at the Guggenheim Foundation, which gives me an opportunity to observe the development of knowledge on a broad front. We receive some 3,000 fellowship applications each year from advanced workers in nearly all fields of learned, scientific, and artistic activity. About a third of these are in humanistic subjects, which include not only the humanities proper, but also the humanistic aspects of other disciplines. Indeed, even scientists sometimes propose humanistic projects to us. Mr. James D. Watson's The Double Helix, for example, was written in part on a Guggenheim Fellowship.

In every one of these fields one can see how the accretion, analysis, and reinterpretation of knowledge is slowly altering the way in which the past is regarded. From time to time the broad results of such changes reach the public in dramatic form. The role of women in history has recently been radically restated, for example, as has that of blacks, particularly with regard to slavery. Such an altered consensus can have substantial practical effects. It can determine what judgments are rendered in our courts, who is elected to office, and what laws are passed. Far more important than these incidental consequences, however, is the assurance that the process itself continues unceasingly in every field, that everywhere fresh work is being done and its implications for existing knowledge are being appraised, that there is no subject without devoted students to whom it is a matter of vital concern. This is a national resource of incalculable value.

The central work of keeping the past available in current form is carried on for the most part in colleges and universities, in independent research libraries and museums, and in centers for advanced study, with the learned societies performing essential coordinating and facilitating services. The results of this continuous process of investigation, analysis, and synthesis are made available through books and journals published by university presses and trade houses of scholarly orientation. The massive structure of organized learning thus achieved has become so familiar a part of the contemporary scene that its invulnerability is taken for granted. Publishers of popular books and magazines assume that it will continue to provide them with data in profusion. The entertainment and advertising industries see it as an unfailing source for the retrospective materials that they need.

Unfortunately, this vast apparatus of learning is by no means an inalterable fact of nature. It has attained its present proportions since the Second World War through a combination of circumstances that will not recur. Not merely has its growth ceased, but it is manifesting an inability to continue even at its present level. Here are some fissures to be observed in what once appeared to be an impregnable monolith. Universities seeking to make ends meet, in a time of inflation, have pared their budgets sharply in areas which affect the humanities. Since the vocational orientation of the present generation of undergraduate students has reduced enrollments in humanities departments, staff cuts have occurred there. There is little demand for new teachers in the humanities, and doctoral programs in these fields have accordingly been reduced and in some cases eliminated. There are more applicants for fewer research fellowships for the senior humanistic scholar, and his prospects of achieving a free year to pursue a big project have been materially reduced. Publication costs have increased by a factor of two or three in the past decade; hence, both university presses and scholarly trade houses find it difficult or impossible to accept specialized humanistic manuscripts, which rarely paid for themselves even under the favorable conditions of the past. Since journals, the significant form of publication in the sciences, have grown more numerous and more expensive, university

libraries are buying fewer books, the significant form of publication in the humanities. Moreover, nearly all independent research libraries have sizable operating deficits and are accordingly showing an increasing inability to offer the services which have previously made them indispensable to humanistic scholars. These are some of the formidable practical problems to which those desirous of aiding the humanities should apply themselves.

V

If the importance of the humanities to society's well-being is recognized, from what sources is there hope of obtaining the assistance they must have? As far as colleges and universities in general are concerned, the nationwide need for student scholarships, staff salaries, and library additions is of such magnitude that it can be met only through recurring appropriations by the Congress and the legislatures of the several states. Selected individual institutions can be helped in a useful way by private as well as public funding, however, as can independent research libraries and museums, learned societies, and university presses.

The National Endowment for the Humanities, authorized by the Congress in 1965, has achieved a size that could hardly have been predicted. In 1975 its budget of $79.5 million exceeded the $65 million given in the humanities by three hundred and twelve large foundations as reported in the Foundation Grants Index of the Foundation Center. The Endowment's emphasis on "the value of the humanities in relationship to people's lives" has led to an extensive program of fellowships for humanists, as well as much research assistance. It has also made grants to humanistic institutions, most notably and courageously to the New York Public Library. A particularly useful feature of its program is its ability to match gifts from other sources. Needless to say, the Endowment has been a godsend to the humanities. Yet, its program excludes major areas of need (operating expenses, construction costs, publication subsidies, etc.), and it is bound by the stringent limitations under which every governmental organization must work. The well-known "G factor" (that is to say, the expectation of wide geographical distribution in grants) is no less potent than in other federal programs, and bureaucratic formalities, restrictions, and delays are formidable.

It might be thought that the $65 million given in the humanities by the larger foundations in 1975 is also a generous sum, but in fact it represents only nine percent of their grants. Despite the fact that the proportion so allocated has remained fairly constant (eight percent in 1972 and 1973 and eleven percent in 1974), the humanities have recently had their striking ups and downs in the foundation world. No doubt influenced by the growth of the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Ford Foundation, which had previously been the big presence in the field, discontinued its Division of Humanities and the Arts after the retirement at the end of 1974 of Mr. W. McNeil Lowry, the Vice President in charge. The Humanities were reassigned to the Division of

Education and Research, where new grants have been minimal, though Ford's support of such organizations as the American Council of Learned Societies and the Council on Library Resources continues to be invaluable. The Rockefeller Foundation had once provided substantial funding in the area. After a virtual hiatus of some years, its trustees in 1974 "called for renewed attention to the humanities," in the hope of illuminating "our understanding of human nature in the late 20th Century world." This promising program is in the process of implementation. However, the major addition to the foundation scene in this context is the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, which places central emphasis on the humanities. Since its formation in 1969, it has provided large-scale support in many areas of humanistic concern. Apart from these giants, the prospects of help are scattered and uncertain, though I may perhaps be permitted to reiterate that each year the Guggenheim Foundation awards many of its fellowships to advanced humanistic scholars, as it has throughout the last half-century.

I suggest that the time is ripe for some change of attitude towards the humanities on the part of foundations. Matthew Arnold once complained that "Wordsworth's eyes avert their ken / From half of human fate." Given their preoccupation with innovation, I wonder if foundation trustees and officers don't have a similarly extensive blind spot. In their professional journals, for example, they are constantly assured that "the genius of America is controversy, not consensus," urged "to get a bigger bang out of the buck," and told that they must achieve the perspective that comes from being "poor, black or brown, female, powerless." This sort of conditioning puts them in what amounts to an adversary position with regard to the past. Some time ago I was invited by a foundation president to talk with him and his chief associates about a program for aiding the humanities which his organization had under consideration. It was a strange session. After my description of each step that might be taken, one of the vice presidents would inquire, "how would that help ethnic minorities?" He was a worthy, if literal-minded man, and I tried to suggest that long-term benefits in the way of softening or removing prejudices would be substantial. I think now that I should have said simply: "What would your response be, if you were asked concerning your program for ethnic minorities, how would it help the humanities? If you want to help ethnic minorities, help ethnic minorities. The humanities claim assistance in their own right, not for the peripheral benefits that may accrue in other areas." It appears that corporations are finding "resident humanists" useful in broadening the outlook of their officers and staff. Perhaps the same device should be adopted by some of the larger foundations.

There is also a consideration of some delicacy that nonetheless has to be mentioned. The influence of foundations in American life is much diminished. There was a time when the Rockefeller Foundation's stated aim of advancing "the well-being of mankind" was in fact tangibly realized from year to year. Today, only the Rev. Sun Myung Moon feels comfortable in boasting that he will achieve "the betterment of mankind."[10] The kind of financial leverage necessary for programs of general human improvement now belongs to government, not to pri-

vate philanthropy. Confined to more limited objectives, foundations would do well to ask themselves where the funds they have available will in fact make a significant difference. The needs of the humanities are concrete and critical, and modest sums of money applied to them can be of immediate and solid benefit. Foundations should consider the claims of scholars in the humanities, their indispensable auxiliaries (librarians, curators, and the rest), the learned societies which coordinate their work, the graduate students who will carry on their disciplines, their workshops (chiefly libraries, but also centers for advanced study), their display cases (chiefly museums), and their means of communication (books and journals, particularly as published by university presses). And in making decisions as to where assistance should go, the basic criterion should be the quality of work performed in the past and hence likely to be performed in the future. It doesn't have to be emphasized that in respect to supporting excellence private foundations have a freedom of choice not always open to governmental organizations.

In my discussion I have not specified individual institutions that deserve foundation help, but there is one whose position is so outstanding and whose need is so dire that I must not conclude without mentioning it. This is the New York Public Library. Its research collection is one of the half dozen greatest in the world, and it has a proud history of vital service to generations of students and scholars--indeed, in countless cases, of students whom it has made into scholars. Despite the word "public" in its name, it has in fact always had to depend primarily on financial sources other than the city. In the New York of today, where the work force of city employees has been cut to the bone, where the schools are understaffed, and where police, fire, and sanitation protection is below the level of safety, this dependence has become more absolute than ever before. The services offered by the research collection of the New York Public Library have already been drastically curtailed, and without major gifts in the near future the doors of its main building at Fifth Avenue and 41st Street could well be closed. Recognizing that this was a case to which its usual guidelines did not apply, the National Endowment for the Humanities has given the New York Public Library an unprecedented $4,375,000 over the past five years, with the prospect of even larger grants to come. This exceeds the $3,364,000 in general-purpose grants which the library has received from foundations during the same period, despite a gift of one million from the Mellon Foundation. The Astor Foundation has also made a one-million-dollar special-purpose grant. Since many of the country's largest foundations are based in New York, where their staffs know the library well through constant use, this relative neglect is particularly surprising.

A philanthropist is by definition a friend of man. The example of the past, particularly as it makes possible "the habitual contemplation of greatness,"[11] is essential if men are to become their best selves. No doubt the demands of practical life make such contemplation difficult to encompass, but it ought at least to be within everyone's reach. I have tried to suggest that this essential resource of mankind cannot survive unless we go on supplementing "the current enlightenment of the epoch" by maintaining the past in "a dignified independent existence of its own." I don't see how philanthropy could have a worthier aim.

*****

NOTES

1. Quoted by Gunther S. Stent, "What They Are Saying About Honest Jim," Quarterly Review of Biology, Vol. 43 (June, 1968), p.183.

2. P. G. Hamerton, Etching and Etchers (London, 1868), p. 123. The poet was presumably Matthew Arnold.

3. Discourses on the Scope and Nature of University Education (Dublin, 1852), pp. 170, 188-189, 217.

4. The Value of College: A Non-Economist's Point of View (New York: Ford Foundation, 1976), p. 15.

5. (New York, 1952), p. 104.

6. New York, August 16, 1976, p.37.

7. New York Times, August 12, 1975, pp. 1 and 39.

8. ADE Bulletin, February, 1975, p. 4.

9. August 8, 1976, sec. 2, p. 4.

10. Time, June 14, 1976, p. 48.

11. Quoted from Alfred North Whitehead by J. Carter Brown in his preface to The Eye of Thomas Jefferson (Washington, 1976), p. ix.

BUSINESS MEETING

Report From the Librarian of Congress

MR. BOORSTIN: It has not been quite one year since I took on the Librarian's post, and I am still trying to learn about it, with what I hope will be the continuing assistance of many of you here. As you may know, it was not a position that I ever applied for, but when I was asked whether I might be willing to consider taking the job, I was a little troubled. I had had many friends who were librarians, and I wondered whether I might seem like an imposter in this world. Having had a year to learn a little bit, I have since discovered that, as I think Oscar Wilde would have said, I am only pretending to be an imposter.

There is an enormous amount to learn about the place and I had the advantage at first of John Lorenz's tutelage. I might add that the Library of Congress and the ARL have an intimate relationship. In fact, I would say we have virtually intermarried since John has come to be your Executive Director. I think it is symbolic and suggestive of the close relationship we want to have.

I came to the Library from the world of scholarship -- or at least I had been trying to be a scholar much of my life -- so I obviously have a sympathy for the special interests of ARL. I would hope that what we do at the Library would further the efforts of everybody here. Scholarship, as we all know, is an active enterprise. It is something that requires the collaboration of a scholar, librarians, and other scholars, and one of our hopes at the Library is that we can further that collaboration in every way possible.

There are also some peculiarities about our resources in the world of libraries, books, and learning which I think might be worth mentioning. This is not part of the report, but at least it is a part of the observations which may suggest some of the directions we are heading. We hear so much today about our depletable resources, especially fuel and other energy resources. As we exchange accounts of our problems, we discover that we do deal in resources that are depleted by inflation, a lack of community interest, and other mishaps. As librarians, however, we are fortunate to be dealing in resources which are essentially nondepletable, resources which increase with diffusion. That is something we want to remember and something we should try to urge the community to remember. I think particularly of an observation that Thomas H. Huxley made about a century ago. He was speaking about scientific investigation -- but it could be applied equally to any other kind of research -- when he said: "The investigation of Nature is an infinite pasture, a ground where all may graze and where the more bite, the longer the grass grows, the sweeter is its flavor, and the more it nourishes."

Our concern is to encourage more people to graze and to help each other water our pastures. This is a characteristic that has always been true of the world of books, for if we preserve books, they are not a depletable resource in the same sense which many of our other national resources are. Our concern

at the Library of Congress, as it is the concern of all the members of ARL, is to increase book resources -- to enlarge those resources and increase their use -- and yet move into the world of the new technology which includes the computer.

I might report to you about what we have been doing at the Library of Congress to share and enlarge the uses of our resources.

My first act as Librarian was to survey the situation at the Library of Congress. I appointed an internal task force of 11 people, whose mission was to report on goals, organization, and planning at the Library of Congress. It had been nearly 40 years since such a general survey had been taken of the Library. The last such survey was begun in 1939 when Archibald MacLeish came in.

The task force is chaired by John Cole, some of whose writings you may have read. John is a very knowledgeable member of our staff, who writes well, has an insight into the history of libraries, and knows the Library of Congress in detail. At the time they were appointed, no other members of the task force had major administrative responsibilities. All of the members had had some experience in the Library, but I did not want anyone in the group with a vested interest in the present administrative structure.

That task force has held hearings in the Library, calling upon the members of the staff, the heads of departments, the chiefs of divisions, and so on, and has asked the entire Library staff to offer its suggestions. Up to this time about 400 suggestions have been received from members of the staff. Although the value of these suggestions is not to be measured quantitatively, I am glad to say that the suggestions do include some realizable objectives, like the suggestion from one member of the staff who wants returned the 65 cents she put in the sandwich machine. But there are other less realizable and more significant objectives. One notable thing is that almost none of these memoranda have been facetious, and almost none of them have been anonymous, including those that suggest the abolition or revision of the division in which the person is working. I think these are healthful signs. They suggest that people are willing to come up with ideas and that they welcome the opportunity to make suggestions.

To enlist the advice of the larger library community and the community of users, we have, with the generous assistance of seven foundations, set up eight advisory groups, one of which came from the community of librarians, and seven others which include groups that either are or should think of themselves as part of our constituency. This includes not only lawyers, but social scientists, humanists, people from the media, people from the performing arts, and other groups. In each case, I appointed a chairman of the advisory group and charged him with the responsibility of selecting the committee members. The selections were made in consultation with me, but the selection was made primarily by the chairman.

These groups spent two days in Washington becoming acquainted with the Library and then had meetings of their own. This fall each of them will be coming back for another session, and each will give us a report by next January 15th suggesting how the Library might be made more useful. One of the advantages of this method is that it has reminded people of the existence of the Library of Congress and has brought some people, including librarians, into the Library for the first time. We hope their reports will help us improve our services, and we hope they will help us improve our capacity to cooperate and serve ARL and all of its members.

We are aiming to open our doors, and we have done so, at least symbolically, by opening what the architects originally intended as the main entrance to the library. That is, not the gravelly bottom floor -- which I think of as the basement -- but the three great bronze doorways at the top of the stairway. When I suggested that we open them, it was objected that if we did open these doors, it would create a draft. I said I thought that was part of the idea. There have been some problems, but I think, on the whole, it has been a good idea.

We have also taken the area which the grand stairway leads to and put some tables there. People used to sit on the bannisters and dangle their feet as they had lunch. We have now put some rather attractive redwood tables with umbrellas and benches in that space and have christened it the Neptune Plaza. People thus know they are welcome in this area where they can look around them and see one of the most beautiful 360-degree sweeps in Washington.

This is symbolic. More concretely, we do want to work with the ARL and to play our role, which I hope you will help us define. In the first place, we obviously want to work toward building a national periodicals lending library, which we have all been interested in and which we have been exploring. I know John Lorenz and others here are taking a leading role in developing this.

We want to make the Library of Congress a center of scholarhip. We want especially to do those things which are more difficult to accomplish in universities, colleges, and other libraries which have to depend on tuition and which are squeezed by inflation in ways that we, being situated in the bounty of the Congress, are not. To find those roles, we need your help.

When we move many of our resources from the main building, which we now call the Library of Congress Building, into the Madison Building, which will, parenthetically, be completed about 900 working days from now, we will have a great opportunity to recreate the main building as the cultural center which it was originally intended to be. We are now laying plans to restore the original building to its pristine glory, and we are making plans to provide places for scholars to work. These new places will not be so meager or so constricted as they have been, since I can see no reason why a scholar should have to do his scholarship as if he were in a strait jacket. There is no reason why scholars

should not have elegant environments in which to work, and we hope to be able to provide rooms offering such an environment. We hope to provide exhibit space to show more of our treasures. We will make the Library of Congress a meeting place where sholars, men of affairs, judges, government servants, and scholars from everywhere can come together, exchange ideas and fertilize one another's minds.

The most important message I want to bring here today is that we are in search at the Library of Congress. We have opened our doors and opened our minds, even perhaps more than our minds have been opened in the past, to any and all suggestions. I want to welcome any suggestions that any of you may have as to how we may be more useful to you, to the world of scholarship, or to your particular institution.

We realize that in the world of scholarship there is no such thing as dominance, but only collaboration. And we hope to collaborate more actively than we have in the past in building the scholarship and the civilization of our country. Toward that end, we invite your help and we offer you our fellowship.

* * * *

Election of Board Members

MS. WHITNEY: The next order of business is the election of three new Board members, and I have asked Page Ackerman and Richard Boss to assist as tellers.

The Nominating Committee was made up of the President-Elect Edward Lathem, Douglas Bryant, and Frederick Wagman, and we are grateful to them for a very good slate. The slate includes:

Le Moyne Anderson	Colorado State
Connie Dunlap	Duke
William Axford	Oregon
Rutherford Rogers	Yale
David Stam	Johns Hopkins

Additional nominations may be made from the floor.

Each member may vote for not more than three nominees.

[After a short interval, Ms. Whitney announced the results of the election.]

MS. WHITNEY: I am pleased to announce that the three new members of the board are Le Moyne Anderson, Connie Dunlap, and Rutherford Rogers.

* * * *

MR. LORENZ: Just to follow up on Daniel Boorstin briefly, ARL does have a living link to the LC task force process in the person of Warren Haas, who is a member of the Library Committee. This would be a very good channel for your advice to LC and something we should keep in mind.

First, I want to say, as I have already told many of you, I like the job. I have always admired the good spirit of cooperation and goodwill in ARL, and I am now enjoying it tremendously. I also like the lack of bureaucracy in ARL, and I think Daniel Boorstin will know what I am talking about. Most of all, I think it is wonderful to have the kind of capable, dedicated, and hardworking staff that we have at headquarters. Suzanne Frankie as Associate is a joy to work with. Duane Webster and Jeffrey Gardner are also gems. P. K. Yu is a very dynamic head for the Chinese Center. And we have made a very significant change in the professional staffing of the Executive Office of ARL. We actually increased the professional staff by 50 percent -- from two to three. I think most of you have already met James Beattie, who came to us from the University of Michigan. Already we do not know how we ever did without him; he is a real addition to the staff.

In the last six months we have seen some pleasing developments in ARL, most of which have been built on the very good work which had been done previously. I cannot resist telling you this incident, because I think it may be unique. On the very first day on the job after Seattle, P. K. Yu and I set up a luncheon meeting with two representatives from the National Endowment for the Humanities. At that luncheon on my first day, we were lucky enough to be able to identify the probable source of a matching grant for the Center for Chinese Research Materials of $200,000. Since then, the grant has been approved and initial funds have been received. We are very pleased to tell you that the Center for Chinese Research Materials is on sound financial ground for the next two-and-one half years.

In addition, you remember the $50,000 from the State Department which had been promised for months and months and months? We finally shook this $50,000 loose and those funds have been received. That puts the Center in good financial shape.

In the process of convincing the Mellon Foundation to put up matching funds with the National Endowment, we developed conversations with John Sawyer, the President of the Mellon Foundation. Again, building on the very good work which had been done in the past, we were able to interest the Mellon Foundation in a project which would add to the work and strength of the Office of Management Studies. We now have approval on that additional project, and funds in the amount of $110,000 have already been received. When Duane Webster reports later, he will tell you in some detail about that particular project.

On the legislative front, I think it has also been a bumper six months, after many many months and in some cases years, of effort. I think the

inclusion of Title II-C in the extension of the Higher Education Act has been a very remarkable achievement, and I think it is in large part due to the communications you have been sending to the Congress. The letters, phone calls, telegrams, and mailgrams that, in many cases, you sent us copies of, certainly must have had their effect, because it is most unusual for this kind of new legislation to go through in the first go-round. That legislation is now solidly in place.

The challenge, of course, will be getting the appropriations, and I understand that the earliest opportunity for appropriations would be a first supplemental budget in Fiscal '77, after the new Congress comes back. That is, if there is a supplemental, because, as you know, the Congress now has a new budget procedure, and I think part of the reason for it is to avoid supplementals as much as possible. If there is a supplemental, however, we certainly want to do everything we can to get initial funding for Title II-C into it. Again, we will be alerting you when the time is most propitious to continue your communications with the Congress.

In the final go-round on Title II-C, there was an important addition to the initial wording of the title. The new language limits the number of institutions which would be eligible for funds in any one year to 150. I think this is a move in the right direction, because it means those funds will be distributed in amounts large enough so that institutions can do something significant with them.

The Office of Education, and specifically the Library and Learning Resources Division, has the responsibility to develop the guidelines and the regulations under this new title. With us today from that particular Division is Paul Janaske. Is there anything, Paul, that you can tell us about how these guidelines and regulations are proceeding?

MR. JANASKE: I suppose the most critical issue is the unresolved budgeting factors you alluded to.

The second issue is the development of regulations. Our office is working on those regulations, but it remains somewhat questionable whether we will be able to implement them within FY 1977. There are time constraints involved in getting regulations through the Office of General Counsel, and a few other stumbling blocks that frequently stand in the way. We are doing our level best and hope that we may get some relief from the normal procedures for issuing regulations. Keep your fingers crossed and perhaps we will be able to get them through this year.

MR. LORENZ: We need to remember that the Federal Government is now on a fiscal year which extends through September 30. Fiscal '78 will therefore begin October 1, 1977. This means that there is more time for the appropriation, distribution and use of funds than there has been before. The HEA Title II-C authorizations are $10 million for 1977, $15 million for 1978, and $20 million for 1979 -- so we cannot afford to lose a year if we can possibly avoid it.

MR. HAAS: I would like to know a little bit more about the regulation-setting mechanism in this case.

MR. JANASKE: For all practical purposes, our staff determines the manner of implementation for the law. In other words, we interpret the law in terms of what you as an applicant must do in order to get a grant. The regulations will ask for rather detailed information. At this stage, I think it is important to remind you that we will be having many of the same problems you are having in trying to establish membership criteria. In limiting the number of grants to 150, we may very well arrive at some of the same rules and regulations that you come up with in your own membership regulations.

The regulations have to clear through the legal office and then the HEW Secretary's office. Thereafter, they must be announced in the Federal Register, at which time you will have an opportunity to respond, if there is any point on which you wish to take issue.

The great difficulty in all of this is that we must follow a time sequence. Once the regulations appear in the Federal Register, we have to wait 60 or 90 days in order to get adequate response. The Secretary has also suggested the possibility of conducting regional meetings so that more people will have an opportunity to respond. This, too, is a time-consuming operation. But it is the time element, the requirement of a certain number of days within each step, that concerns us, and we hope that there is some way that we can get around it.

MR. LORENZ: We have been assured that ARL will continue to be involved in developing guidelines and regulations, as it already has been.

I do think some of the remarks that Louis Wright made this morning are pertinent. You remember Mr. Wright's reference to the desirability of a national plan for resource development and resource sharing? It seems to me that the development of such a plan would never be more timely than it is now, because funds under this new title could assist very effectively in implementing a national plan. I will be talking to Alphonse Trezza about forwarding a move in this direction.

Another very important piece of legislation -- and one that we have all been watching for many, many years -- is the Copyright Revision Bill. It seems to me Stephen McCarthy and John McDonald could write a book on what ARL has been through on this one. I think the results represent what the six national library associations (who have been together on this all the way through) feel is the best possible compromise that could be obtained at this time.

I think it is important to remember that the effective date on this legislation is January 1, 1978. This gives us, in effect, 14 months for further information, further guidelines, and further communication. As we know, the Copyright Office has a great deal of preparatory work to do to get this Act moving. I think the Commission on New Technological Use of Copy-

righted Works will also continue to play a role in monitoring the results of this legislation and further revisions of it.

We have no one here from the Copyright Office, but I wonder if there are one or two key questions that any of you have on the copyright legislation.

MR. NELSON: If we wanted to obtain continuing information on the bill, for what information would we write our congressman?

MR. LORENZ: The ALA Washington Newsletter had a very good analysis of the sources of information that now exist on the Act. I think if you follow those references, you will get everything that now exists.

The six national library associations have also agreed that any further explanation of this Act-- and specifically the library photocopying provisions -- would go out in a single text. The American Library Association has taken the responsibility of preparing a first draft of such explanatory material, and this will be reviewed by the other five associations. After we agree on the document, it will be disseminated to all librarians at the same time, giving the same information. I think we should look forward to this further explanation.

MR. MCDONALD: If it is appropriate, I might just say a word about the NCLIS photocopying study. Some of you have undoubtedly been approached with the screening form being used by the contractor working on this study for NCLIS. A number of questions have been raised with the contractor about the appropriateness of a library submitting this information, particularly about whether it would be held in confidence or whether it might jeopardize a library's legal position in the event of a challenge from a copyright proprietor.

Tomorrow there will be a meeting of the Advisory Committee, which I will be attending, and we will learn about this process. But my own suggestion would be that you cooperate with the study if you are asked to, because I think it is under reliable auspices. I also think we have nothing to fear from it, and I would like to see those ARL libraries that are approached cooperate if they possibly can.

MR. LORENZ: I think it is important to remember that the guidelines under 108(g)(2) apply only to library photocopying in the field of interlibrary lending. All other library photocopying would fall under fair use. It seemed that publishers and authors were more concerned about the interlibrary lending aspects of library photocopying than they were about any other-- that is the reason why most of the discussion focused on 108(g)(2). But again, in-house library photocopying will be governed by the fair use provision.

Then, of course, you have the very complicated guidelines that exist under photocopying done by teachers for classroom purposes. As far as I know, there was no discussion of how photocopying for educational and classroom purposes might be related to library photocopying. But I presume this differs on almost every campus in terms of the inter-relationship.

There are two other provisions in the copyright legislation which are minor but could become major: One provides that an archive of radio and television materials be established in the Library of Congress. The other, which was negated, would have given the National Technical Information Service authority to copyright U. S. government-document materials. ARL submitted a strong letter to the Conference Committee opposing the NTIS provision, and that view prevailed.

A third item I would like to mention is an amendment to the National Endowment on the Humanities and National Endowment on the Arts legislation which authorizes funds for challenge grants to cultural and arts organizations.

George Farr, from NEH, is with us today, and I believe he would like to elaborate on this new provision for challenge grants. I understand $12 million are available in Fiscal '77 for this purpose.

MR. FARR: We thought this membership might indeed be interested in this program, and I have brought along the specific provisions for this new challenge grant authority.

The Endowment for the Humanities is authorized under this legislation to establish and carry out a program of contracts with public agencies and nonprofit organizations for the purpose of:

(a) enabling cultural organizations and institutions to increase the levels of continuing support and to increase the range of contributors to the program of such organizations and institutions

(b) providing administrative and management improvements for cultural organizations and institutions, particularly in the field of long-range financial planning

(c) enabling cultural organizations and institutions to increase audience participation in and appreciation of programs sponsored by such organizations and institutions

(d) stimulating greater cooperation among cultural organizations and institutions especially designed to serve better the communities in which such organizations or institutions are located

(e) fostering greater citizen involvement in planning the cultural development of a community, and finally,

(f) undertaking certain special programs that have particular Bicentennial interest.

As you can readily see, these provisions are general in the extreme, but they do seem to offer great opportunities for research libraries.

We in the Division of Research Grants have always anticipated that the Association of Research Libraries might be among the principal beneficiaries of such legislation. Sometimes, of course, we have to be reminded that we are but one of four divisions of the Endowment, and that other divisions may also have thoughts about how this money could be spent.

As has been said, we have an authorization of up to $12 million. The grants that have been authorized would enable us to fund up to 50 percent of the total costs of a project on a one-to-one match. Specific guidelines for the new Challenge Grant program should be available by early March 1977.

Those of you who have been in conversation with us before about other matters will recognize, even with the reading of this rather generalized language, that it potentially allows us to support libraries in activities for which we have never had the authority before. These include promotional costs, certain operating costs, fund-raising costs, permanent additions to staff (long-range planning), as well as special programs.

What I am here to say to you today, after speaking especially about this matter with Harold Cannon, who is the new Director of the Division of Research Grants, is that, while the Division is formulating its own policies on how to approach this new challenge grant authority, and while, indeed, the Endowment as a whole is making certain decisions about this, we would welcome an expression of your interest in this legislation. We would also be happy to send you a copy of the legislation.

If you did have a sense of how you thought this money could be spent usefully and effectively in your own libraries, if you had some ideas for particular programs which you thought might fall under this legislation, if we had that expression of interest from you, we would then be able to go to the rest of the Endowment, as well as to our own Division, and say, "Here is an audience, here are certain kinds of programs" as we begin to develop the specific ways in which this challenge grant authority could be used.

I think the most direct way of getting in touch with us would be to write to Harold Cannon, Director of the Division of Research Grants, Mail Stop 350, National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, D.C. 20506.

MR. LORENZ: A question of last night, George. How do these challenge grants differ from the matching grants provision which has been in existence?

MR. FARR: Principally, I suppose, in the kinds of activities we may be able to support. In addition, the new legislation provides for a three-to-one match, whereas, in the past, our gifts-and-matching awards were made on a one-to-one or two-to-one basis. The broader range of activities which we may now support will, we hope, make it easier to raise the larger match.

Another difference would be in the ways in which money for matching might be defined. Before, there has been some concern that the money brought to these matching funds be new money, which is, of course, often quite difficult. I think that, in this sense, we may now have a freer hand.

But, as I say, these issues are in the process now of being developed, because we have just recently received the terms of this legislation. We are in the process of formulating our own guidelines, and we would be most eager to hear from you.

MR. LORENZ: Getting back to ARL, I am very pleased to report that we are in a sound financial position. The office wants to be of the best possible service to you in the utilization of our resources. It is probably trite, but never more true, that rapid and significant change is occuring at a greater pace than at any other time. At times like these, maintaining the best possible communication among ARL members on important items would be to everyone's advantage. The ARL office wants to contribute to improved communication. We believe that with our present staff we can get out more ARL newsletters and special memos. I think you can take this as a general and open invitation to let us know what kinds of information you want from us that you're not getting through other available channels. We also want to invite you to submit any news that you want to share with other members of ARL.

We are also prepared to send you sets of mailing labels listing ARL libraries. One library recently requested eight sets to help distribute information to all other ARL libraries. We think this is to be commended and encouraged, and we are glad to give you this service at cost.

* * * *

JOINT REPORT OF THE
SUBCOMMITTEE TO REVIEW CRITERIA FOR MEMBERSHIP IN ARL
AND THE
TASK FORCE ON CRITERIA FOR NON-UNIVERSITY MEMBERSHIP IN ARL

(See Appendix A for the joint report of these committees)

The next item on the agenda is the report on recommendations for ARL membership criteria. It's a dual report, but Bill Budington is going to speak for the Ackerman-Budington Task Force.

MR. BUDINGTON: I thought Mrs. Whitney was going to term this the Ackerman-Budington Axis. That would not be entirely inappropriate, because we have been in communication for some months now, and there have been periods, as we struggled to get to meetings and make sense of what we were doing, when it seemed that the whole world revolved around that axis.

As you know, there have been two groups working on criteria for membership in ARL. Page Ackerman has chaired a subcommittee dealing with ARL membership criteria applicable to academic institutions. In my case, I have dealt with those select institutions called independent research libraries, to whose worth I am glad to say both speakers this morning drew to your attention. On several occasions during the last year, we both put together reports for the Board after consulting our respective committee memberships. The reports issued to the Board were circulated to the entire membership in late spring and summer, and your comments were invited. The final decision was to report jointly to the membership at this meeting, and all of you have received copies of our joint report.

The matter of membership criteria has, of course, been bothering us for some little time, probably for the last 20 years in fact. You will recall that we first established objective criteria back in 1961. In 1962 we had 72 members. In the next ten years we increased our membership by 13. But, under the present criteria, we have added 20 new members in the last four years.

We received a variety of responses to our report this summer and fall. We had responses from perhaps 10 to 15 percent of the total membership which is not a large number -- but the responses were very thoughtful, and some were very long. The report you have received summarizes very briefly the concerns and the agreements which issued from these responses. There was, first of all, general agreement that the membership should be limited in order to preserve the Association's integrity and effectiveness. There was general agreement that the Association should continue to be an association of research libraries. There was an agreement that we very much need to achieve a balance between our quantitative and our qualitative criteria. There were conflicting views, however, on how you go about accomplishing these three goals. There were also conflicting views on consortia, which are not, strictly speaking, libraries, and on non-academic libraries.

On the basis of these responses, the two committees decided that membership criteria could not be put back in the closet again. This is a matter that needs very serious consideration, and it is a matter on which the Association desperately needs to focus. As a result of this, the two groups came up with four recommendations which we would like you to consider at this meeting. These recommendations have already been presented to the Board for its consideration, but I would like to read them to you at this time. We recommend:

(1) That ARL establish a task force on ARL membership to review and revise membership criteria for all types of research libraries and research institutions, with the specific objectives of achieving an appropriate balance between quantitative and qualitative factors applicable to research collections in both academic and non-academic libraries

(2) That the Executive Director be authorized to make funds available for special task force projects, within reasonable limits. We do not think that, on a volunteer basis, we can necessarily spend the time needed to thoroughly consider the matter

(3) That the task force be asked to make annual status reports to the Board and that a final report with recommendations to the membership be made not later than the October 1978 meeting. This is not to say that the task force could not report earlier, but it cannot take longer than October 1978, and

(4) That, effective October 1976, pending recommendations from the Task Force, there be a moratorium on the admission of new institutions to membership in the Association of Research Libraries.

Madame President, on behalf of these two groups, I move the adoption of these recommendations. [Carl Jackson seconded the motion.]

MR. ROUSE: I just wanted to ask about number 4, the October 1976 moratorium. Is that open-ended?

MS. WHITNEY: No. It is intended that there be a moratorium only while the task force is studying and until it reports its recommendations. I think it might also be helpful to tell you that the Board has been following this very closely and is in accord with the recommendations of the Task Force.

[A vote was taken. The membership approved the recommendations.]

* * * *

REPORT OF THE JOINT ARL-CRL COMMITTEE ON A NATIONAL PERIODICALS LENDING LIBRARY

MR. BRYANT: I last spoke to ARL on this subject at the May meeting in Seattle, and I am very happy to say that there have been a number of important developments since then. It is now safe to say that this country generally recognizes the need for a central collection of serials whose contents are designated for ready access to scholars and students throughout the country.

A Task Force of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science was appointed about a year ago to study the practicality of a national periodical system -- and "system" was the key word in the Task Force assignment. There are five members of the ARL-CRL Committee who are also members of the NCLIS Task Force, so there is a large overlap and interplay of opinion between these two groups. At its meeting in June, the Task Force agreed that there should be a national periodicals library as one component in the national serials system which the Task Force was appointed to consider.

The Task Force also agreed in June on what has come to be called a three-level system, envisaged at the present time as follows: a series of local, state or regional collections holding 2,000 to 10,000 serial titles which would handle, presumably, a very large percentage of the most frequently requested articles. These collections now exist in many forms and in a number of places, and they may be added to as time passes. These would be local, state, and regional collections, and, as I say, many of them already exist.

The second element would be a national periodicals library, or conceivably more than one if the necessity for this became evident. This library would have in its files approximately 45,000 serial titles, including the commonly-requested titles owned by local and regional collections.

The third level would be a structure for providing copies of articles in journals not included in the 45,000. These would, under present thinking, be covered by the three national libraries and other large and specialized research libraries throughout the country. Needless to say, access to materials beyond the 45,000 titles would presumably be through bibliographic files being created by CONSER.

The NCLIS Task Force met the day before yesterday to refine this plan and began drawing up specifications and criteria for the realization of this system. The Task Force itself is expected to complete its work very early in 1977.

The ARL-CRL Joint Committee on the National Periodicals Library is now drafting a statement of the purpose, constitution and governance, financial arrangements, scope, and operational criteria for what we have agreed in the Committee we will provisionally call the National Periodicals Library. The Committee is meeting again next week to continue its work on drafting this document.

The prospect for establishing a national lending facility for serials (and I think, perhaps, we should all agree that the establishment of a center in no way precludes the addition of monographs at a later time) seems now more promising than ever before.

In this connection I can report one promising move that was taken two or three weeks ago. The Committee on Institutional Cooperation, which, many of you will recall, includes the presidents of Big Ten universities plus the University of Chicago, passed a resolution endorsing the concept of a national periodicals library. Similar resolutions will be put before other bodies in coming weeks and months.

All of us who have been working for many years toward this seemingly elusive goal are especially heartened by recent expressions of interest on the part of the Library of Congress. You heard the librarian himself refer to this earlier this afternoon. The collaboration and support of the Library of Congress are essential.

Furthermore, I think we can look to the new Title II in the Higher Education Act as a source of fiscal support for the establishment and operation of a national periodicals library.

The situation is highly fluid, as I am sure most of my remarks have suggested. But the outlook is bright. We believe that some steps toward realization of the prospect should be evident in the relatively near future.

* * * *

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERLIBRARY LOAN

MR. LUCKER: First of all, I thank all of you for returning the interlibrary loan questionnaire we sent out. As of today we have 101 returns out of 105. Some just reached me today, however, so we are still in the process of pulling the results together.

The Committee met at noon today in what was actually its first meeting since the questionnaire came back. The information I have is consequently rather fresh. We have not even tabulated all the answers, but I thought at least I would tell you some of the preliminary results.

The key question everyone is concerned about is, "How many libraries are actually charging for interlibrary loans or will be shortly?" Based on the information we now have in hand, there are nine libraries, including three Canadian libraries, charging for interlibrary loans. This includes one library which proposes to start charging early in 1977.

One question we sought to answer through the questionnaire was whether there would be a snowballing effect after several libraries began charging. At the moment, we can do no more that surmise that the number of libraries charging is nine.

The nine libraries I am discussing here are those which charge a wide range of users. They make exceptions for networks, exceptions for consortia, and several local exceptions, but all of them are distinguished by charging a wide range of users. There are also four libraries which charge only profit-making organizations. If you put them together, the total number charging is 13. But if you want to establish a meaningful framework for discussing interlibrary loan charges, the real number, in my view, is nine.

The rest of the information we are still in the process of collating. We thought we designed a relatively simple questionaire. I guess the questions were simple, but the answers were much more complicated. Trying to understand what people thought we meant is getting to be a little cumbersome, but we have a lot of useful information on photocopying and networks, all of which we hope to send out to the membership shortly.

I will be reporting to the Board tomorrow morning on our proposal for publishing a report. I cannot tell you how soon you will have it, but I consider myself obligated to get something out to the membership immediately. That means not more than a month, I hope.

The Committee will continue monitoring the whole question of charging and the related question of coupons. Some time ago, the Committee established a liaison with the ALA Interlibrary Loan Committee. We will continue working with the ALA group on common interests.

One thing I want to ask you here, as I will in my report: would you please keep me informed, whenever any of you changes your policy? If you have been charging and decide not to (which is unlikely), or if you have not been charging and decide to, please drop me a note when you make the decision. I would appreciate it very much.

Could you also let me know whenever you discover that a non-ARL library is charging for interlibrary loans. I know this is more difficult, but I would very much appreciate this information. The Committee does not believe the number of non-ARL libraries is large. I have been able to identify only one public library which I know is charging. But if you let me know of non-ARL libraries -- public, college or university -- which are charging, I will take care of following up with a questionaire.

I guess that is my report. I will be glad to answer any questions.

MS. DUNLAP: As I recall, one of the questions asked us to indicate whether our library intended to charge in the future. Was there much evidence of this?

MR. LUCKER: No, but again, this is just a quick scan. I have only had the answers for a few days. A lot of libraries are thinking about it, but the specific question is "Are you or aren't you?" I have given you the numbers of those who are. I think there is one more library which is very seriously considering charging. A lot of libraries have said, "We have to think more about it" and this is always ongoing. Of the nine, eight actually have put the charge into effect, and one will.

* * * *

REPORT OF THE
COMMITTEE ON PRESERVATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARY MATERIALS

As most of you know, this Committee has been dormant for a number of years, and this is its first report in some time.

The Committee's last major effort was the Haas Report, Preparation of Detailed Specifications for a National System for the Preservation of Library Materials, published in early 1972, which is just now beginning to bear fruit in the Library of Congress' effort toward development of a national preservation plan. In this report today I want to outline what I see as the major changes which have occurred since that report. I want to propose some fairly straightforward objectives for the Preservation Committee, and, finally, to name a committee to work with me and with you, the membership, in attempting to meet some of those objectives.

The Haas Report concerned itself primarily with specifications for a national system of preserving library materials. Since that report was published, some new developments have eased the problems of preservation while others have exacerbated the situation.

To give the bad news first, I would cite among the latter these distinct trends:

(1) The fairly sudden deterioration of production standards and the growing predominance of "perfect binding" of serials, trade books, and even university press publications. I see this especially in this country and to a lesser extent abroad. This decline in quality can be observed both among the products of publishers and of commercial bookbinders. There is no doubt that the paper quality and physical structures of printed materials are declining and that this expands the dimensions of our preservation problem dramatically.

(2) Economic stress, the main cause of that decline in standards, has affected libraries as much or more than publishers. Greater pressure on budgets has made preservation dollars even more difficult to justify in light of other ongoing responsibilities. Many would ask today why individual library directors want to allocate scarce resources to preserve materials which only a few researchers might want to read.

(3) There seems to have been a decline in interest in the thrust of the Gordon Williams' Report, which addressed the whole preservation question in 1965. There is less interest now in the notion of a national preservation collection intended to hold one de-acidified copy of all books, though the idea of identifying "national resource" copies is apparently still alive. In one sense, the failure of this Committee to meet or make reports to the Association since 1972 might be taken as a sign of declining interest generally, though development and funding of a national preservation plan could change that picture.

On the brighter side, certain changes would seem to make efforts toward a national system for preservation more feasible now:

(1) The commitment of the Library of Congress to a national preservation plan is a significant and hopeful sign. I might say, incidentally, that the LC effort is a full commitment now. In mid-December, the Library has scheduled a meeting of conservators, librarians and other interested parties to work on a draft of a national preservation plan.

(2) The growth and sophistication of nationally accessible bibliographic data bases would seem to make the problems of bibliographic control in any national plan more easily manageable.

(3) Proposals for (and the recent development of) local and regional conservation centers and the expansion of research in conservation -- especially in mass de-acidification methods -- have also been encouraging.

(4) There has been an increasing and healthy awareness of the danger of the oversewing machine to the preservation of library materials, especially periodicals.

(5) The increased emphasis on micropreservation programs has assured at least the temporary survival of the contents of certain books, despite the lack of coordination or bibliographical control for some of those programs.

Following are some of the objectives the ARL Committee on Preservation hopes to pursue. I have shown this list and a longer list to a number of conservators, as well as to some of the members of the Committee, and we have been told that it is a little over-ambitious. We have tried to cut down a bit, and this is what we hope to start working on:

(1) To offer support and counsel for the national preservation plan recently proposed by the Library of Congress. I can tell you that the Library of Congress is extremely interested in ARL participation and support.

(2) To take initiatives toward creation of a nationally accessible on-line data base of microform masters. This would assure bibliographic control of materials preserved on microform and aid coordination of further activity in this direction. The National Register of Microform Masters should form the nucleus of that data base.

(3) To plan facilities, possibly tied into regional network developments, for producing microform copies from these masters, as needed, and to aid smaller research libraries in producing masters from their own collections.

(4) To develop standard criteria for setting priorities in preservation of library materials, for example, guidelines on the possible disposition of individual monographs or serials. Of course, this relates to other projects that are in the works.

(5) To compile a current listing of preservation activities in ARL libraries and other research institutions and to promote the sharing of expertise, information, and experience among those listed.

Three concluding observations:

First, I think it is important to recognize that conservation concerns are not limited to lesser-used materials. This is the stigma which puts preservation low on our institutional priority lists and it will take widespread efforts to remove that stigma.

Secondly, the ARL membership should realize that greater coordination of preservation activities could have important ramifications for both collection development and space problems. While the English concept of the "self-renewing library" may be too saccharin a euphemism for zero growth, it is true here as well as in England that something has got to give in a time when construction dollars are disappearing.

Thirdly, I would emphasize the need to share our expertise and experience in the area of preservation. This Committee will do its best to pursue that objective.

The Committee as it now stands consists of Joanne Harrar of the University of Maryland, College Park; James Govan of the University of North Carolina, and myself as Chairman.

MR. BOES: One of the things about ARL's preservation activities that concerns me is the apparent lack of interest in non-print media. By that I mean recordings, television, and so on. It happens to be an area which is of increasing importance; yet where there are vast recording collections, say at Syracuse, which are unparalleled, many of them may deteriorate unless there is some concern about their preservation. These things, too, are important -- maybe not as important as the problem of paper and printing -- but certainly of increasing importance. I think if we are going to be concerned about preservation, we should simultaneously be concerned about the non-print media.

MR. STAM: Your point is very well taken, and I will do my part in bringing it to the attention of the people working on the national preservation plan.

MS. DUNLAP: The other day I heard, sort of third or fourth-hand, via someone who is either involved in a preservation shop or is a freelance preservation worker, something to the effect that NEH had tons of money available for support of local or regional preservation shops. Is there any truth to that?

MR. STAM: I am going to ask George Farr to answer that question. I can say from talking to Margaret Child at some length that there is great interest there. But she certainly did not say there is "tons of money" for conservation activities.

MR. FARR: I certainly enjoy the concept of tons of money, and we are working toward it all the time. Margaret Child is the Director of our Collections Program, which is a special program in the Division of Research Grants. The Collections Program makes grants for preservation and for making materials in collections accessible for cataloging and preservation. Grants for microfilming materials are also possible. She would, I know, welcome any inquiries that you may wish to make about programs such as these.

Alas, we always have a limited amount of money in relation to the excellence of the projects that are suggested to us, but I think that should not inhibit any inquiry for this particular kind of program. It is one of the special interests in the Division of Research Grants at the present time.

MS. DUNLAP: What kind of things might you fund?

MR. FARR: Well, here again, anyone interested should write to Margaret Child, because we have specific guidelines developed for this program. If she were here, she could tell you all what is involved. Generally, funds might be available for preserving materials and for making materials accessible to users, up to the point of fairly simple guides to collections.

Margaret's program also funds source surveys, and accepts applications for non-print materials.

When you move from that level, say, to bibliographies and research materials involving more than one source, you should write me in the Research Materials Program, because there we actively fund the creation of major reference works in the Humanities. Bibliographies, dictionaries, and other similar research materials are covered, along with major scholarly editing projects, which a separate Endowment program supports.

MR. STAM: I could add, incidentally, I found Margaret Child extremely supportive of the second objective I read, which has to do with establishing an accessible on-line data base of microform masters.

MR. McDONALD: Am I not right in thinking that NEH, through a different division, has joined the Council on Library Resource in supporting the Barrow Laboratories?

MR. COLE: They have done this, but temporarily, I am sorry to say. NEH has informed us that it will not support a mass de-acidification program in the future, which, of course, is very disturbing.

MR. STAM: I should say that this small committee has not addressed the question of funding.

* * * *

REPORT OF THE
JOINT ARL/ARCL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY STANDARDS COMMITTEE

MR. SMITH: Since I last reported to you, the Committee has met several times. I think we are moving along toward what I had announced earlier as our goal: to submit a draft of standards to you and ACRL early next year. We will try to meet our deadline.

We have essentially a draft version down on paper. We do feel the need for further work on it over the next two or three months, but hopefully we will have a version to bring before you early next year. At that time I suspect the Committee and I will have a great deal to say, and you will have a great deal to say to us.

MR. SCHICK: I assume you are going to use some definitions and terminology. Right?

MR. SMITH: I think we will try to define the terms we think need defining, yes.

MR. SCHICK: I would like to share with you whatever definitions and terms we have that are nationally and internationally accepted, because creating new terms, if it is not absolutely necessary, is a burden.

MR. SMITH: I do not think that we see our work in competition with the kind of work that you have been involved in. And I certainly do not think we are interested in creating any confusion where clarity currently exists. Our interest is quite the opposite.

* * * *

REPORT OF THE OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARY MANAGEMENT STUDIES

MR. WEBSTER: Since the Office was created in 1970, it has concentrated on three basic programs: (1) applied research and development, (2) information collection and dissemination, and (3) training. I will report some highlights of our efforts in those areas that have taken place since the May membership meeting in Seattle.

In the research and development area, our most publicized activity is the Management Review and Analysis Program, the assisted self-study process that has now been completed by 23 member libraries. Since May, the fourth application of that program, involving seven libraries, has approached a conclusion. The Office has received MRAP study reports from six of the seven libraries, all of which, like earlier MRAP reports, are available from the Office.

During this period, the Office also assisted Johns Hopkins University in the fifth MRAP application. This application was distinguished by monthly training sessions for the entire study team, which the Office conducted at the library. This new approach to training was one of a series of efforts to smooth the self-study process at member libraries.

Currently, MRAP is being applied by a non-member, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Library, which is paying for program materials. In addition, at least two ARL libraries are very seriously considering the program and will probably start it next year. In the future the Office will continue making MRAP available, though changes and refinements will be made constantly. Hopefully, we can revise the Manual and publish it within this next year as a way of making MRAP more readily available to academic libraries.

A separate study, currently being funded by the Council on Library Resources, will attempt to assess the impact MRAP has had at participating libraries. This study is being done by two people from Pennsylvania State - Edward Johnson, a librarian, and Stuart Mann, a faculty member in operations research.

A second project in our Research and Development Program is the NASIC study. NASIC is the Northeast Academic Science Information Center, an NSF-funded project aimed at spreading the use of machine-based bibliographic search services in academic libraries. Jeffery Gardner has worked rather extensively with NASIC, especially in preparing the original survey report which described current methods of managing and using search services at academic libraries. As a result of his work, the Office issued an ARL Management Supplement on this topic.

Since the May membership meeting, the Office has issued two more publications concerning machine-based information services. One is an Occaisional Paper entitled Handbook on Introducing Machine-Based Information Services in Academic Libraries, which gives academic libraries guidelines for staffing, training staff, and operating these services. David Wax, former Director of NASIC, authored the paper.

In addition, Jeffery Gardner and David Wax co-authored a Library Journal article which discussed some of the problems that have kept on-line bibliographic services from being more widely available.

A third developmental project has been the McGill Staff Performance Appraisal Program. Here OMS assisted the library in developing specific goals against which each unit could measure individual staff performance. OMS worked with Marianne Scott and key McGill staff, both to design the program and to train supervisory staff to implement it. OMS has since issued a report which describes the program and includes a supervisors training manual.

A fifth research and development project this year has been the Academic Library Development Program (ALDP). This is a program supported by the Council on Library Resources, aimed at designing a self-improvement procedure for small and mid-sized academic libraries. The Office has provided some help in designing and operating the pilot study being conducted at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. The Council has expressed some interest in supporting further testing of the ALDP procedure at three or four libraries during the next year.

In addition to these several research and development projects, OMS has had a continuing interest in projects concerned with the management of collections in research libraries. Recently the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation awarded the Office $110,000 to study the selection, acquisition, retention, and preservation policies of research libraries. This project seeks to devise analytical procedures which help libraries assess both their present collections and the collection development process through which that collection will change. Ultimately, it is hoped that libraries will be able to bring their collection development policies into closer accord with the actual capabilities of their collection development process.

We are starting this project immediately, and expect we will complete its three phases within one year. The initial phase, taking about four months, will include a field survey of several member libraries. During this period, we will also create an advisory committee to help design the analytical review procedure. The second phase will involve actual tests of the procedure in a small group of member libraries. The testing will require about six months. The concluding months will provide an opportunity for the advisory committee to decide whether the procedure is useful and can be applied in other instances.

Another major emphasis in our work has been on information collection and dissemination. In this area, the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center is our principal activity. SPEC is designed to systematically collect documentation on current practices in ARL libraries. Most recently, the Center has issued four SPEC Flyers and kits reporting on surveys of user services in research libraries. One of these Flyers covered the question of bibliographic access in ARL libraries. Another discussed physical access to research

library collections. The two other Flyers reported on the results of a UCLA sponsored survey on gifts and exchange procedures and computer systems in research libraries.

To date, OMS has issued 30 SPEC Flyers and associated kits, covering a wide range of topics. Current plans call for a Fall survey on budgeting processes and analytical decision-making techniques. At some point in the spring, we will conduct a survey on security and management of the library's physical plant.

In addition to these publications, the OMS has issued an ARL Management Supplement on the use of non-librarian professional specialists in academic libraries. This was the product of a fellowship study project done by Keith Cottam from the University of Tennessee.

The third major program operated by the OMS involves organizational training for research libraries. Since the May meeting, the Office has sponsored three management skills institutes. The first, at Airlie House in August, attracted 41 participants. An assessment of that event has already been mailed to each member library. In September, the Office conducted a second institute at Stanford University for West Coast librarians. This time, 39 librarians participated. Following the public institute, the Office conducted an in-house management institute for the supervisory staff at the Stanford Library.

Another activity has been the Training Film and Resources program. Part of the purpose of this two-year old effort has been to look at the wide array of management films that are available and select those that have some usefulness in research libraries. From the more than 100 films we have received, we have so far selected five. We have then put together specialized training and discussion materials that accent their use in academic libraries. Two of our recent film selections give instruction in budgeting supervisors' time and in chairing committees effectively.

Looking beyond the programs of the Office, I should also mention that we anticipate changes in the structure of the bodies which advise the OMS. When the Hopp Committee recommended earlier this year that ARL commissions be dissolved, the Management Commission suggested the formation of a new OMS advisory body that would include both librarians and university administrators. In October, the Board approved a proposal which detailed this recommendation, and the Office is now establishing the new committee.

I will conclude by reiterating some of the OMS priorities for the coming year. First, the Management Review and Analysis Program will continue to be available to member libraries. We believe there is still a demand for, and an interest in, taking advantage of this package of self-study resources.

Our second priority will be the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center. SPEC continues to be one of the most widely used of all services provided by

the Office. Almost every member library has either contributed to, or taken advantage of, some of the materials that have come out of SPEC, and we have one person, Nancy Zeider, who is devoted full time to the SPEC Operation. From our experience in conducting MRAP and the management skills institute, it is obvious that improved training, particularly in supervision and management is a major concern among member libraries. As part of a plan to expand its training program, OMS is thus recruiting a new staff member to serve as a training program coordinator.

Finally, we will be embarking upon the collections analysis project. This is a new direction for the Office, both because it is a new problem and because the source of funding is new. In a real sense, this project will become an overlay on the rest of the OMS programs and activities, because we are committed to the Council to maintain our present program even as we add these new responsibilities. It is only by adding the training coordinator that both Jeffery Gardner and I will be able to devote the required proportion of our time to the collections project.

I again seek your comments and reactions to what the OMS is doing. Jeffery Gardner and I pride ourselves not only on listening to your advice, but on doing something about it.

* * * *

SPECIAL REPORT: NCES LIBRARY SERVICES BRANCH

MS. WHITNEY: We have done rather well at getting through our agenda, and I would therefore like to honor a request from Frank Schick of the Library Surveys Branch of the National Center for Education Statistics.

MR. SCHICK: I would like to tell you what the NCES is doing in regard to college and university library statistics, and to tell you with whom we are going to work in the near future.

The 1973 Survey of College and University Libraries has been published. Meanwhile, the 1975 Survey is on its way to GPO. The 1976 Survey is coming in at such a good pace that we have about 70 percent of the responses collected. We expect to close the survey out in a month or so with a 95 percent return. I think this is the most successful of all the surveys of my organization.
The National Center for Education Statistics is part of HEW. It was once part of the Office of Education, but Congress divorced us about 18 months ago.

I want to talk briefly about the 1977 Survey, which has nearly been finished for clearance. It is necessary that we finish this by the end of the year, so that you may receive your questionnaires next May or June. Fortunately, we have been able to step up the reporting so it takes only about half the time. This means that in nine months we can get out a survey that includes 95 to 97 percent of all academic libraries.

The new facets of the college, university and other statistical surveys is that we are working closely with professional associations such as ALA, ACRL, and ARL. Suzanne Frankie and Jeffrey Gardner have been advising us on survey instruments for the last three or four years. I met today with James Schmidt from SUNY Albany to discuss the possibility of enclosing ACRL's salary survey in the 1977 NCES survey. I hope this will be possible.

We have also been meeting in the last couple of weeks with Frank Stevens from the Office of Education. We are probably going to include the questions he needs to make grants under HEA Title II in our 1977 survey. If this can be worked out, you will not receive a separate report form from Mr. Stevens. If you do, it may only ask "How much money do you want?" I do not really know how Mr. Stevens operates the program, but in the past, he had always found it necessary to ask for statistical data which demonstrated his maintenance of effort. Since his questions are just about identical to the ones we ask in the college and university, we have decided we can save your time and HEW's money.

We are also working with the National Commission on Libraries in connection with the White House Conference. One piece of the White House Conference program will be a national inventory of library needs, which shows several areas of need for public, school and college and university libraries. The needs will be expressed as a funding gap, an expenditure gap, a manpower gap, a resources gap, and something about physical facilities that are needed. The data used for the national inventory are all being taken from our surveys.

At the same time, we are responding to a request by CONTU that we include questions on interlibrary loan and copying in our surveys. CONTU is required to provide this data, and when CONTU goes out of business in two or three years, this same function will be taken over by the Register of Copyrights.

For the moment, we are going to supply the data for CONTU.

At the request of the National Library of Medicine, we are asking one or two questions in all surveys about the holdings in health science libraries. This information will be used to back up the extramural program of the National Library of Medicine.

Finally, we work with the Department of State in supplying triennial data on all types of libraries to UNESCO.

We are aware that ARL has a statistics program but the two programs do not conflict because they differ so greatly in scope. We supply data covering about 3100 academic libraries to organizations and publishers of encyclopedias. ARL is not quite that large yet, unless John has some secret plans to expand it to this large a universe.

Our data are representative of the country as a whole. We do get an excellent response and we need it, because our surveys do not get published unless we have about an 85 to 88 precent response. We have never had that problem with college and university surveys. There is a possibility -- I have no idea how small or great -- that the 1977 survey may not be conducted. Or, if it is conducted, it may be undertaken in a smaller way, for the following reason. The College and University Survey is part of HEGIS, the annual survey consisting of eight or ten parts which is sent from our office to all academic institutions. Now the money for HEGIS, which amounts to a quarter million dollars, was to be spent between July and September of this year -- the adjustment period from the old federal fiscal year to the new. Unfortunately, all ten surveys of the HEGIS package were not contracted out. Hence, there is now a shortage of about a quarter million dollars. How the NCES Administrator is going to cope with this, I do not know. But if there is a shortage of $250,000 something will happen, and we may need your help.

If there are any questions, I would be glad to answer them.

MS. DUNLAP: I heard recently of a growing number of institutions which are refusing to answer government questionnaires if they are not required by law. I think this is a form of retribution for so many of the government regulations and the great many questionnaires they now have to fill out. HEGIS has been cited as one that they will not answer. Do you see a growing trend here? Or is there anything that you can do to get the library part of it out?

MS. SCHICK: This criticism, to the best of my knowledge, is not related to the library part of the questionnaire. Of ten different HEGIS surveys, the library part is actually the one that has generated the largest percentage of return for the last five or six years. The only group in which people refuse to answer is public libraries.

Out of a universe of 1,500, we also had three or four who said, "We will be happy to answer, but it is going to cost you $35." In another place it is going to cost us $22. I do not know how they arrived at these figures, but in the end, we obtained the questionaires. We obtained them by going to the head of the state agency in that state. But I have not encountered this problem, so I have no comment.

MS. DUNLAP: The reason for my concern is that when we realized recently that we had not seen the HEGIS statistical forms, we called the administrative offices. They said, "Oh, we are not going to answer that this year, and it has already been thrown out." I do not know whether other institutions are going to react this way or not, and what effect that might have.

MR. SCHICK: I appreciate being informed about that. I think it alerts me to the fact that we should make it possible to combine our survey with Mr. Stevens' survey on the HEA Title II program. Maybe if we get ACRL's personnel survey included, people in ACRL could write to their administration saying, "You are cutting out things that we want to know ourselves."

MR. KREISSMAN: You have advised us on what we can do for you. There is certainly one thing you can do for us. That is, would you please publish your new questions the moment you have them defined so we can start collecting statistics in those areas where we may not be collecting them?

MR. SCHICK: I want everyone here to know that this is not a planted comment. But I appreciate it more than anything. I have been trying to do this and I have not been successful so far. I would love to give our questions to anyone who cares to publish them the moment we have them cleared. If ARL or ACRI would take that responsibility on, it would be most helpful. I have been trying to peddle this idea for the last six or seven years, but nothing has happened.

We would love to give the questions to anyone who wants them the moment they are approved by OMB.

MR. LORENZ: I suggest you try the ARL Office. We may be able to get them out through the Newsletter.

MR. SCHICK: We would be happy to put them in, in some shortened form. It would be an especially good idea since, with the personnel survey, questions from the National Library of Medicine, and so on, there will be some changes and some additions. We have some brochures about the program up here, and please take them. If not, the ARL office will probably be willing to send them out.

* * * *

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

MS. WHITNEY: It really is not neccessary for me to review the enjoyable year I have spent as your President. There have been plenty of minutes, newsletters, and reports distributed; yet it has been an exciting year. Each year you have heard a President look back and comment on why his or her year has been unusual. I think I have had a good claim to an unusual year.

I mentioned in May, and I will reiterate again, that I have had two exemplary Executive Directors to work with, and a marvelous staff. I certainly appreciate their help. I want particularly to mention the help I had from John McDonald and then John Lorenz, Suzanne Frankie, Duane Webster, and Jeffrey Gardner, and lately James Beattie. They have all been great. In other respects, this has also been a rather unusual year. It seems to me this is the year we let go of the commissions. This created, at the very fine recommendation of the Hopp

Committee, some extra responsibilities for the Board. I hope you have read the Minutes of the Board meetings -- recognizing that we are having some extra ones -- because we are trying to do your bidding, and it is very important that we get feedback from you, either through the Office, through Board members you know, or in any way possible, so that the Office and your Board can be following your direction.

We have also set up -- as another follow-through on the recommendations -- the device of naming task forces, with clearly defined charges and a limited number of years to bring in some results. This is, of course, a new experiment. We seem to think it is going to be productive, and we want you to realize that you should give the task forces your comments.

It has, as usual, been a trememdous opportunity to serve you as President. It is probably one of the most enjoyable experiences I have ever had. At this end, as everyone tells you, it does not seem like much work. But whatever amount of time one spends on it is more than amply rewarded by the great experiences, the friendships that are made, and all of the interesting and exciting education one gains.

Just before I finish, I would like to publicly thank the four members who are leaving the Board for their excellent contributions:

Richard De Gennaro, as our past President, Page Ackerman, Gustave Harrer, and Richard O'Keeffe. As you know, we will have three new ones joining us tomorrow morning.

In addition, I would like to thank each and every one of the members for their support and to tell you that, in the usual ARL tradition, I made not one request that was turned down.

* * * *

MR. LATHEM: Happily, there is within this Association no tradition of a presidential inaugural address. We had, some of you will remember, a brief tradition of a presidential inaugural joke. Blessedly, that lasted only one meeting.

I would like, however, to say that one of the special circumstances that attends a person's occupancy of the post I have just relinquished is that the President-Elect has a particularly good vantage point from which to observe and to assess an aspect of this organization which the general membership relates to somewhat more remotely. I refer to the functioning of the Board of Directors, the officers, and the headquarters staff. I have, during the past year, come to know this element of our organization intimately, and I want here to record my admiration for it. I want to say, also, that I reply confidently on the prospect, in the months ahead, of being sustained by the colleagueship of the Board and the other officers and the staff.

Most particularly, in my brief remarks, I want to pay tribute to someone, for all of us jointly. I am here directing remarks at our indebtedness and deep thanks to one who has been so charming and gracious and efficient and productive a President, Virginia Whitney.

If there is no further business, I declare the adjournment of the 89th Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries.

* * * *

APPENDIX - A

September 20, 1976

JOINT RECOMMENDATIONS ON CRITERIA FOR ARL MEMBERSHIP

ARL Task Force on Criteria for ARL Membership for
Non-University Libraries and Non-Library Agencies
Subcommittee on Criteria for ARL Membership

Introduction

Between ten and fifteen percent of ARL's membership commented on some aspect of the two preliminary reports on membership criteria issued in April 1976. While not numerous the responses were thoughtful and useful. Taken as a whole, they indicate that:

- There is general agreement that ARL membership should be limited to preserve the Association's integrity and effectiveness.

- There is general agreement that ARL should continue to be essentially an association of research libraries (i.e. their institutions) directly engaged in developing their own collections and serving scholars.

- There is general agreement that we should attempt to achieve a balance between quantitative and qualitative factors in ARL's membership criteria in spite of the recognized difficulty of developing explicit measurements of quality.

- There are conflicting views on the validity and practicality of proposed guidelines for admission of consortia and non-university libraries.

- There are conflicting views on the validity and practicality of the proposed guidelines for developing measurements of quality.

On the basis of these responses and their own deliberations the two working groups are convinced that continuing and focussed attention should be given to the whole complex question of eligibility for ARL membership. In the preliminary reports issued earlier we discussed the factors which characterize this transitional period and which must serve as the context for the reevaluation of membership criteria.

We recommend:

A. That the ARL establish a Task Force on ARL Membership to review and revise membership criteria for all types of research institutions with the specific objectives of achieving an appropriate balance between quantitative and qualitative factors applicable to research collections in both academic and non-academic libraries.

B. That the Executive Director be authorized to make funds available for special Task Force projects within reasonable limits.

C. That the Task Force be asked to make status reports to the Board annually and a final report with recommendations to the membership not later than the October 1978 meeting.

D. That effective October, 1976, pending recommendations from the Task Force, there be a moratorium on the admittance of new institutions to membership in the Association of Research Libraries.

If recommendation A is approved, we suggest that the Task Force consider the following propositions as preliminary guidelines.

1. The definition of the collection should include all forms of material of research significance, especially microforms and manuscripts.

2. Collections should be described by a standardized set of subjects, e.g. major LC categories, HEGIS fields or other methods.

3. The measure applied to fields of collections should be by titles held and titles added, supplemented by a statement of acquisitions policy.

4. Unique holdings should be identified by a brief narrative description, as some materials such as pictures, broadsides, etc. are not readily quantifiable.

5. Quality of service should be measured in terms of national dependence, i.e. ratio of loans to borrowing, including photocopying.

6. Quality of access should be measured in terms of number of service staff; bibliographic access should be assumed unless there are unique tools that can be identified.

Respectfully submitted,

Page Ackerman, Chairperson
Subcommittee to Review Criteria for ARL Membership

William S. Budington, Chairperson
Task Force on Criteria for ARL Membership for
Non-University Libraries and Non-Library Agencies

Distribution:
ARL Membership

APPENDIX - B

FINAL REPORT OF THE ARL TASK FORCE - NEH
RESEARCH TOOLS PROGRAM
(with Attachment A)

The Task Force on the NEH Research Tools Program has had several meetings, both formal and informal, since it was first formed in early 1975. A review of Task Force activity would not seem to be needed, but I can assure you that the following recommendations do not come from a position of pure speculation. The Task Force has met with members of the NEH staff, including Ms. Margaret Child and the present Director of the Research Tools Program, Dr. George Farr. In addition, the present chairman has served on an NEH Research Tools Program Review Panel and has discussed possible ARL activity with regard to the program with the former Director and with several staff members at the Washington office.

Based on our deliberations and discussions, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

1. We recommend that ARL should not become directly involved in making any specific proposals to the NEH Research Tools Program. Any direct involvement of ARL would seem to be inappropriate in light of the NEH guidelines which encourage individual rather than institutional submission of proposals. NEH must, under all circumstances, maintain independence to review and approve proposals from the entire spectrum of the scholarly community, not just from ARL institutions.

2. We recommend that ARL make one major effort to publicize the NEH Research Tools Programs among its members. That there is wide interest among ARL libraries in the Research Tools Program cannot be denied. When the former chairman of this Task Force solicited research tools suggestions from ARL members, more than 40 institutions responded and provided more than 150 specific projects. The Task Force recommendation is that ARL send to all members a memorandum similar to the one attached to this report (see Appendix A).

3. We recommend that ARL discharge this task force. We believe that it has no permanent utility for ARL and that if future need arises it would be better to establish a new task force with a new charge.

I would be delighted to talk personally with you or the Board and provide more background and rationale for these recommendations.

Respectfully submitted,

W. David Laird, Chairman
Richard Dougherty
James Henderson
Hyman Kritzer
David Sparks

Attachment - A

Proposed Memorandum to ARL Libraries:

Subject: NEH Research Tools Program

We wish to call attention of ARL member libraries to the National Endowment for the Humanities Research Tools Program. Through this program, full or partial funding can be provided by the Federal Government for the development of specific research tools.

As you may be aware, grant proposals should be originated in the name of specific individuals (one or more) within an institution. NEH will not accept proposals from an institution unless a specific "principal investigator" is identified. ARL's intention in this regard is merely to encourage submission of proposals for research tools of potential interest to the research library community. Attached to this memo is a handbook which gives the basic data on the NEH research grant programs. Additional copies of this handbook can be obtained, free of charge, from the Research Grants Office:

National Endowment for the Humanities
NFAH Mail Stop 350
806 - 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506

Also attached to this memo is a list of specific projects submitted by individual ARL libraries upon solicitation of ARL Task Force on the NEH Research Tools Program. More than 150 recommendations were made, and the Task Force has arranged them into form and type categories purely for purposes of reference. It is our hope that if this list is widely circulated among ARL librarians it may help generate specific proposals to NEH. Questions about the Research Tool Program should be directed to Program Officer, Dr. George Farr, 202-382-1072.

RESEARCH TOOLS

SUGGESTED FOR DEVELOPMENT

BY ARL MEMBER LIBRARIES

The following suggestions were assembled by the ARL Task Force on the NEH Research Tools Program as the result of a questionnaire to the membership. The responses to that questionnaire have been here assembled by (1) form of library material dealt with and, in the case of bibliographical tools, by (2) the topics or academic disciplines dealt with. Inevitably, it was necessary to list several unusual suggestions under (3) miscellanea.

This sorting of the membership's suggestions into form divisions and bibliography is the second attempt to assemble the results of the questionnaire. The number listed beside each item refers to the number of the item on the original list. The number in parenthesis to the right of each item indicates the number of times the item was mentioned in the respones to the questionnaire.

FORM DIVISION

1. Manuscripts and Archives
   - 105. Guide to historical manuscripts at Yale (1)
   - 113. Guide to modern literary manuscripts (1)
   - 131. Guide to manuscript sermons in the U.S. (1)
   - 132. Guide to the archives of major newspapers and television networks (1)
   - 145. Guide to Lat. Am. Mss in L.C. (1)

2. Public documents
   - 108. Complete state imprint inventories (1)
   - 119. Natl. depository for state pubs. will full bibliog. control and access (1)
   - 126. Bibliog. of foreign govt. docs. (3)

3. Business directories
   - 25. Update in loose-leaf format McNierney's Directory of Bus. and Finan. Services (2)
   - 36. Bibliog. of world-wide trade and National bibliogs. (2)
   - 81. Directory of Chambers of Commerce (1)

4. Biographical directories
   - 41. Comprehensive Lat. Am. biographical directory (2)
   - 59. Index to London Times obituaries (1)
   - 63. "Current Biography" type compilation of new academic and lit. figures (4)

68. Multilingual index to names of historical figures, including saints (1)
86. Who's Who in Am. Journalism, including photojournalism (1)
96. Update of Who Was When (1)
98. Biographical directory in the field of psychology (1)
127. Biog. dictionaries of Am. minorities (1)
137. Russian biog. dictionary (In English) (1)
138. Bio-bibliog. of 20th cent. artists (1)

5. Microtext materials
1. National microform processing center (19)
40. Index to microform titles in collections (2)
62. Index to the micro-edition of the U.S. Supreme Court briefs (1)
76. Index to (Univ. Microfilms' ?) Am. Periodical Series (1)
107. Natl. or intl. union list of manuscripts on microform (1)

6. Music documents
22. Union list of sheet music (2)

7. Festschriften
43. Annual index of new Festschriften (2)

8. Antiquarian catalogs (books, mss.)
67. Index to Sotheby, Parke-Bernet and Christie's auction catalogs (1)

9. Pictures, prints and other graphics
19. Index to art exhibition cats. (2)
90. Index of early Am. painting (1)
99. Update of the A.L.A. Portrait Index (1)

10. Sound recordings
53. A phono-record review digest (2)
139. Index to songs and arias by great singers on LP records (1)
140. Index of folk songs on records (1)

11. Multi-media materials
133. Guide to multi-media materials for academic libs. (1)

12. Newspapers
37. A PTLA for small presses (2)
64. Indexes to metropolitan city newspapers (3)

13. Patents
65. Data base providing retrospective subj. access to U.S. Patents (1)

14. Theses and Dissertations
120. Expand Diss. Abs. Intl. to be comprehensive (1)
121. Expand Masters Abstracts to be comp. (1)

15. Academic Research & Programs
    - 26. National data bank of course and degree offerings at U.S. colleges (2)
    - 79. National directory of interdisciplinary academic programs (1)

16. L.C. Apparatus, Refinements
    - 39. Replace the LC Subject Cat. with an NUC Subject Cat. (2)
    - 122. Provide a comprehensive NUC location register (3)
    - 148. Pub. of LC's monographic series cat. (1)
    - 149. Pub. of LC's retrospective name and series authority file (1)

17. Catalogs of Libraries
    - 111. Bibliog. of printed cats. or published descriptions of foreign library resources (1)
    - 146. Union cats. for various east Asian languages and countries (1)

18. Topical encyclopedias
    - 23. Historical encyc. of colleges and universities (2)
    - 75. Black encyclopedia (1)

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

19. Guides to the literature of a topic (academic field)
    - 3. Comp. guide to materials for the study of N.Y.C. (3)
    - 12. Create a good basic bibliographic guide to anthropology (3)
    - 16. A bibliog. guide to the study of Italian lit. (2)
    - 17. A bibliog. guide to the study of French lit. of 19th and 20th cent. (3)
    - 31. Prepare good basic bibliographic guides to any of the following subjects: architecture, art, ethnic studies, lit., music, photography, psychology, rhetoric, speech, sociology, threater arts (2)
    - 33. Various bibliogs. in classics such as L'Année Philologique, Dix Années de Bibliographie Classique, and Bibliotheca Scriptorum Classicorum (1)
    - 89. Bibliog. of journalism and mass. comm. (1)
    - 92. Guides to Biblical research (1)
    - 112. Guide to Byzantine history and culture (1)

20. Topical bibliographies, Update of existing works
    - 2. Update of Work's Bibliog. of the Negro (2)
    - 4. Update Baldensperger's Bibliog. of Comparative Lit. (2)
    - 5. Update Paetow's Guide to the Study of Medieval History (2)
    - 6. Update Beers' Bibliogs. in Am. History (2)
    - 7. Update Hoffman's The Little Magazine ... (2)
    - 8. Update Bemis' Guide to the Diplomatic Hist. of the U.S. ... (2)
    - 9. Extend Hasse's Index to U.S. Docs. relating to Foreign Affairs ... (2)
    - 10. Update Hatzfeld's Critical Bibliog. of the New Stylistics ... (2)
    - 11. Update Hammond's Soviet Foreign Relations and ... (2)

13. Update Thomas' Guide to the Diplomatic Archives of West Europe (2)
14. Update Hamer's Guide to Archives and Manuscripts (2)
27. Update Gregory's American Newspapers ... (10)
28. Update Lippincott's New Gazeteer ... (2)
29. Update the Polart Index to record reviews (2)
30. Update Winchell's Guide to Reference Books ... (2)
34. Swedish national bibliog., 1700-1829 (2)
50. A book review digest encompassing more periodicals (2)
51. Comprehensive version of the Alternative Press Index (2)
56. Completion and updating of bibliogs. of criticism of Italian lit. (1)
60. Cum. index to the MLA bibliogs. (1)
71. Update International Congresses and Conferences ... (3)
72. Update Gregory's Serial Pubs. of Foreign Govts. (5)
78. Update Halkett's Dictionary of Anon. & Pseudon. English Lit. (1)
80. Update Thompson's Motif-index of Folk Lit. (1)
84. Update of the catalog of the Center for Research Libs. (1)
85. Bibliog. of Am. Mags., 1741-1820 (1)
100. Update of Cumulative Dramatic Index (1)
101. Update of Guide to the Performing Arts, and include circus (1)
102. Update of Griffin's Bibliog. of Am. Hist. Societies (1)
103. Fill the gap in Writings in Am. Hist. (1941-7) (1)
106. Fill the gap (1943-1971) between Bib. der Rezensionen and Intl. Bib. de Rez... (1)
116. Computerize the MLA bibliog. (1)
117. Update and complete Kuntz's Poetry Explication ... (1)
128. Compilation of the Union List of Serials and N,ST (1)
141. Cum. index for Index Translationum (1)
142. Cum. index for Bibliographic Index (1)
143. Cum. index for MLA bibliog. (1)

21. Topical bibliographies, Creation of new works

A. Art
69. Index to photography journals (1)
66. National union list of art periodicals (1)
20. Union list of So. Califor. art periodicals (2)

B. Drama
15. A theater and film journal index (2)
55. Index to European articles on 18th and 19th cent. drama (1)
94. Compilation of various indexes to plays in collections (1)

C. Music
21. Index of pre-1949 music periodicals (2)
91. Index (?) of country and western music (1)
97. Bibliog. guide to rock music (1)

D. Literature

38. An STC for the 18th cent. (5)
42. Index to current fiction (1)
47. Index to 18th and 19th English lit. periodicals (2)
48. Compilation into a single list of all the indexes of literary material (2)
52. Current sci. fi. index (2)
57. Bibliog. of French-Canadian lit. (1)
70. Compile Abstracts of English Studies to provide single search access (1)
73. Index to poetry criticism, esp. modern poets (1)
74. Index to poetry in periodicals (3)
82. Dictionary of quotes from 20th cent. lit. critics (1)
88. Bibliography of Asian publications on Am. and English Lit. (1)
95. Bibliography of literature in translation (1)
115. Current and ongoing bibliog. of Afro-Am. lit. (1)
134. Bibliog. of concordances of literary works in English (1)
136. Index to anthologies of Am. lit. (1)
151. Bibliog. of lit. crit. of Am. ethnic minorities (1)

E. Philosophy

93. Compilation of various indexes in philosophy (1)
114. Computerized index to articles on Am. philosophy (1)

F. Social Studies & Humanities

32. Bibliog. of women's studies (2)
35. Bibliog. on popular culture (2)
44. Comprehensive index to reviews of current research on soc. sci. and hum. (2)
45. "Index Medicus" type index for soc. sci. and hum. (2)
46. Index to book reviews in the health sciences (2)
49. Index to current ethnic studies material (2)
62. Cum. subj. index to soc. sci. & hum. periodical indexes (1)
77. Index to the Chronicle of Higher Education (1)
109. Bibliog. of sources of historical statistics for Europe (1)
118. Comp. bibliog. of costume with multiple access points (computerized) (1)
130. Pub. of E. Kaizer's cardfile of Afro-Am. hist. and culture (NYPL) (1)
144. Index to the Statutes at Large (1)
150. Comp. bibliog. of Am. Indian hist. (1)
152. Bibliog. of Okla county and town histories (1)
153. Comp. bibliog. of Okla. (1)
154. Guide to sources of business history in Okla. (1)

F. General Bibliography

24. Author and subject index to 18th and 19th cent. periodicals (2)
87. Bibliography of "newsletters" (1)
104. A guide to tell where individual periodicals are indexed (1)
123. One index to cover 10-20 major U.S. newspapers (1)
129. Guide to collections of foreign newspapers with holdings (1)
135. Index to the Village Voice, esp. to arts and lit. coverage (1)

G. Miscellanea

54. Union list of Russian books in U.S. research libs. (2)
110. Index to maps of Texas in books and periodicals (1)
124. Inventory of material on Spain in U.S. libs. (1)
147. Guide to lib. and arch. resources on Russia (1)

MISCELLANEA

22. Miscellanea

18. Comp. compilation of U.S. election results, local and national (2)
58. Comp. guide to Christian religious sects (1)
83. Dictionary of social work and welfare terms including street talk (1)
125. Guide to Afro-Am. clubs, theaters and other associations (1)

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARY MANAGEMENT STUDIES

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARY MANAGEMENT STUDIES

SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT

DECEMBER 1976

1527
New Hampshire
Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
(202) 232-8656 or 2466

I. INTRODUCTION

The Office's work with member libraries during 1976 has indicated that research libraries are primarily concerned with: (1) increasing financial pressures, (2) the need for improved processes for building, maintaining and servicing collections; (3) the difficulty in understanding and influencing libraries' organizational environments, (4) the need to improve libraries' effectiveness by redefining their goals, and (5) the requirement to clarify the role of library managers and improve the use of staff resources.

During 1976 the Office has responded to these concerns through the following efforts:

- Six libraries completed the Management Review and Analysis Program and issued final reports which are available from the OMS.

- Several years of work with the Northeast Academic Science Information Center's (NASIC) study of machine-based information services concluded with the development of two publications related to the use of these services by academic libraries.

- The Office contributed to the design of a focused self-study procedure for smaller academic libraries (the Academic Library Development Program) and the pilot test of this procedure at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

- The Office began a study of the management of collections in research libraries, aided by a grant of $110,000 from the Andrew Mellon Foundation.

- A CLR fellow working with the Office completed a study of the use of managerial and technical specialists in research libraries. His study led to an ARL Management Supplement on the topic.

- The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) conducted two surveys, prepared and distributed seven SPEC Flyers and Kits, responded to 2,908 requests for information, (including 2,041 orders for SPEC Kits and 816 orders for other publications), and maintained 131 SPEC subscriptions from non-member libraries.

- The Office conducted three Management Skills Institutes during 1976, involving 122 library staff.

- The McGill University Library tested a goals-based staff performance appraisal program which had been designed by the Office and McGill Library staff. The Office then published a description of the program.

- The OMS Management Training Film Program added three films covering such topics as chairing committees, managing time, and the relationship of supervisory expectations to employee performance.

- OMS staff participated in five regional workshops on a range of management and library issues.

This annual report first outlines some of the conditions in research libraries which have shaped the OMS approach to library management studies, then describes the activities of the Office during 1976, and finally presents Office priorities for 1977. A list of OMS publications during 1976 is included as an attachment.

II. ISSUES OF CONCERN TO RESEARCH LIBRARY MANAGERS

The challenges facing research library managers have changed substantially in recent years and now seem to have settled into a disconcerting pattern. Financial support for libraries has stabilized at the same time that inflation is exerting a disproportionate impact on the collections and staffing budgets. Concurrently, library users and supporters have been calling for more and better services. While available technology can potentially revolutionize the way libraries function, the expense and difficulty of applying it limits extensive implementation. Thus, library managers are expected to do more with less in almost all areas of their operations.

OMS work with member library directors and staff has focused attention on a range of critical managerial problems which can be viewed as dilemmas. The OMS programs are based on the assumption that these dilemmas must be studied and that the application of contemporary management thinking can help research libraries perform their fundamental mission. While these dilemmas are not easily resolved in traditional ways, the ingredients for necessary change in the organization and management of libraries already exist and must be dealt with. This brief report cannot cover all the problems facing library managers, but some of the more obvious and pressing are discussed below.

A. THE INCREASING FINANCIAL PRESSURES ON RESEARCH LIBRARIES

A review of 1976 operating statistics for ARL members shows that 46 per cent received no budgetary increase or a budgetary increase that did not equal the rise in the consumer price index. This problem is compounded by especially dramatic increases in the cost of library materials. In 70 per cent of ARL libraries, budgets rose less than did the cost of periodicals. In 80 percent, budget increases did not keep pace with monograph price increases. There is strong evidence that most research libraries must perform with less money and reduced purchasing power in the forseeable future.

Library directors are recognizing that effective management of stable or declining academic library budgets can only be accomplished by accepting the inevitability of some hard decisions. In the short run, these managers are making temporary cuts and streamlining activities. Over the long term, however, other responses are being considered. The need to get more of the nation's resources channelled into cooperative efforts in support of research libraries is an obvious step but requires the education of key administrators and legislators and the development of better analytical methods for describing needs of research libraries. While there are examples of activity in these areas, including the Research Libraries Group, the current legislative effort with Title II C of the Higher Education Act, and the movement toward establishing a National Periodicals Program, even if these efforts succeed, they will not permit libraries to maintain the expense of their current practices.

Libraries are not simply waiting for national developments or for more money from their parent institutions. Many are experimenting with efforts to improve the use of available money by developing internal management processes, improving supervisory skills and practices, applying contemporary management techniques to the resolution of problems and utilizing better analytical and cost information in the decision-making process. The practice of setting priorities, eliminating or diminishing activities of less importance is increasing. The dilemma facing research libraries is to do the few most important things well or risk the possibility of becoming organizational mediocrities which fail by trying to do everything.

B. IMPROVING THE PROCESSES FOR BUILDING, MAINTAINING AND SERVICING RESEARCH LIBRARY COLLECTIONS

Research libraries are beginning to rethink their objectives in the area of building and maintaining comprehensive and distinctive research collections. More than most others in higher education, library directors are painfully aware of how costs are eroding their ability to secure, process, and service research collections. Yet users, particularly teaching faculty, often equate large collections with the essence of research library quality. The inability of libraries both to control the costs of maintaining these collections and to satisfy demands for better collections is a disturbing dilemma that calls for fresh ideas.

Again, regional, or national resource sharing programs can provide some relief. The Center for Research Libraries has provided this kind of support and perhaps a National Periodicals Program will help. But, there is increased recognition that individual libraries must examine the various alternatives to present collection development practices.

While some have bought time by eliminating duplicate serials and monographs, many have entered a new phase in which tougher decisions must be made--decisions which will irrevocably affect the nature of their collections. For some libraries, it will mean questioning the continued maintenance of special collections of national importance but of little immediate local utility. For others it might lead to movement away from the development of broad, research collections toward maintenance of current, working collections. Still others might be forced to consider the reduction of public service efforts to avoid the irreparable erosion of essential collections.

Whatever possibilities are considered, research library directors sense that they are not going to be able to operate their collections programs as they have in the past. To revise their collection development programs new tools and resources are needed which will assist library managers in making decisions that will control costs without sacrificing service quality. Decision models for allocating materials funds, techniques for relating collection policies to user needs, and procedures for gaining access to materials not in a library's collection are prime examples of areas requiring further development.

C. UNDERSTANDING AND INFLUENCING THE ENVIRONMENT OF RESEARCH

It is important for research libraries to monitor changing conditions in their institutional milieu, assess the implications of those changes, and adapt library programs to reflect emerging conditions. Part of the complexity here is that libraries interact with numerous pressure groups rather than a few which are specific and controlled. Relationships with these external forces affect internal policies, plans, and programs of research libraries. For example, various user groups, university administrators, consultants, the federal government, state governments, the community and professional associations all have certain expectations and requirements that must be negotiated by library managers.

On one level this is a political process in which the identification and cultivation of local power groups is a critical managerial task. In many cases this is a largely irrational process in which relationships are as important as performance and in which decisions are sometimes made to avoid confrontation, regardless of their impact on library performance. But regardless of what the library does or how well it performs, there will be some environmental pressures which appear to be arbitrary or impossible to satisfy.

Recognizing the existence of these political pressures, there are possible organizational responses to the environment which can go a long way toward influencing the library's

success. First, directors are seeking better management information systems which describe library costs in relation to benefits to assist the library in changing its programs and to describe to its clientele the economics of the services they demand or require. Second, libraries are trying to develop a clearer understanding of the nature of their constituents to provide a stronger justification for library budget needs, particularly in universities supporting a range of research and instructional programs.

Third, library directors are promoting stronger communication links between libraries and their parent institutions. Libraries need to know, in advance, when new research interests are to be represented in their universities, and university administrators need to be aware of library costs for adequately supporting these new interests. The library needs to be formally involved in the university's planning structure and to adapt its program emphasis accordingly. Finally, recognizing the importance of influencing their environment, many libraries are placing greater emphasis on public relations programs designed to develop community support by describing their role and various successes.

Another environmental concern is the maintenance of user satisfaction with library collections and services. The library does not want to satisfy one segment of its clientele while ignoring other segments with very diverse and expensive needs. Maintaining user satisfaction with limited resources requires an active program for determining user needs and for assessing the library's success in meeting these needs. Informal contact with faculty, students and other users provides much of this information but more formal investigations are needed to define, rank in importance and respond to these information needs. For while total user satisfaction has always been an unreachable goal, decisions on collection and service emphases can be directed toward the broadest, possible satisfaction only if they are based on a firm understanding of what is needed at a particular time. Systematic inventorying and analysis of user needs and behavior can also tune faculty and students into library service capabilities and program constraints. But the important point is the interest of libraries in reassessing their current activities and in changing what they do, based at least partially on what they learn about their users and their political environment.

D. CHANGING LIBRARY PERFORMANCE THROUGH REDEFINITION OF GOALS

Standard library functions are the core around which structure, technology, and people are deployed. Organizational inertia and individual comfort with the status quo contribute to a tendancy for those functions to remain untested and

unchanged over time but new demands for increased effectiveness call for a re-examination of library priorities. Defining and describing library goals is an initial response by many library managers to this need. They have found that goals help provide a measure of progress and library success. When the staff are involved in the process they learn more about their work and its value in achieving broader library purposes and their commitment to library priorities is enhanced.

There are, however, numerous problems with goal-setting programs. Preoccupation with current tasks tends to limit consideration of long term strategies. Furthermore, libraries have many possible goals that compete for attention, and goal-setting can degenerate into a political process in which the interest is not in the long term fate of the organization but in the growth of departments and the advancement of individuals. Inevitably, people tend to treat immediate goals more seriously than distant ones, and various work units rarely understand or even think about the goals of the total organization but instead tend to compete with each other in an atmosphere of conflict.

But, library directors recognize that organizations change regardless of what management does or does not do and goals programs have helped control and direct change toward constructive ends. They force members of the organization to adapt to new financial realities, new user configurations and new technical and service possibilities. Because the process is ongoing, the organization can shape its future according to new, or newly understood, realities.

Solving the problems facing libraries requires flexible and adaptive organizations. As library managers identify and institute needed changes, they must deal with resistance to change, and operate processes for continual feedback, evaluation and accomodation. A goals structure is one example of a framework that libraries are using to assess performance and adjust activities to move closer to meeting critical needs.

E. IMPROVING THE MANAGEMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES: THE ROLE OF LIBRARY MANAGERS

Large organizations are often plagued with problems such as low staff morale, inadequate flow of information, conflict, rivalry and lack of cooperation in the way people work together, and relatively stable levels of productivity. Staff often feel overworked, unappreciated and not supported. Because research libraries are large, labor intensive organizations, similar problems can be expected. Understanding the causes

of these problems and doing a better job of managing human resources is one of the major challenges facing research library managers.

Experience suggests several characteristics about people-related problems in libraries. First, staff satisfaction affects library productivity. If staff are bitter, discouraged, and complaining and operate with a nine-to-five mentality, library services, relationships with users and general performance are adversely affected. Secondly, the array of staff complaints in libraries relating to the way decisions are made, lack of communication, poor performance of key staff, and inadequate leadership are not necessarily an objective recital of facts. Frequently, these complaints are symptoms and represent failure of the organization to recognize and deal with individual needs and relate these needs to library requirements. For example, staff performance reflects a configuration of relationships within a social system which influences work roles and standards. Yet most supervisors have little training in basic interpersonal and communication skills required for dealing with these relationships and roles. Furthermore, individuals are not motivated solely by economic incentives but by diverse psychological factors. Behavior is affected by feelings, perspectives, and attitudes. The informal work group can do more to influence behavior and performance than reorganization, personnel offices, or elaborate staff training programs.

Improving the management of human resources in libraries requires that library staff be carefully selected, well trained, and assigned clear roles and responsibilities. These are basic tasks that have traditionally concerned library managers. While these activities deserve continued stress, the current needs of staff require a new perspective on individual behavior in organizations. The task of setting a healthy, productive organizational climate is an example. This managerial responsibility centers around building on the natural motivation that most people have by creating an atmosphere that will encourage talented people to do a good job. To do this, library managers are responding to the needs of library staff to grow and develop, to experience a sense of worthwhileness, to be active contributors to library work and to get feedback on that contribution, and to be part of a successful library program.

While sensitive to human needs and behavior in organizations, library managers are also developing higher standards of professional and staff competence within libraries. Innovative approaches to performance appraisal recognize this need. The peer review process, based on dual considerations of individual professional growth and individual contribution to organizational performance, is one such approach. Another is goals-based

performance review programs that de-emphasize the traditional review of individuals' personal characteristics and emphasize instead individuals' actual job accomplishments. Of particular significance is the focus on mutual problem-solving and planning, rather than on merely identifying past successes and failures. Many of the new performance review processes stress career counseling and planning. A related trend is the reordering of many libraries' reward systems, so that remedies are more important than punishments, the future is more important than the past, and the opportunity for individuals to grow is more important than the technical administration of salaries and wages.

Expanded staff commitment and responsibility requires talented staff operating in a climate in which individuals are respected and their growth can correspond to organizational growth. Individual and organizational objectives can be related if management recognizes that staff have a vital role in their success and can contribute to the design of libraries' objectives, policies, and procedures. The skills of library staff members can be more fully utilized, providing greater fulfillment to the individual while enhancing the performance of the library. In this context, development of staff is not restricted to increased technical awareness, but includes an increased understanding of the opportunities and constraints facing libraries and the array of forces leading to managerial decisions. Fuller involvement in the enterprise can lead library staffs to expanded awareness of their part in the organization and of their contributions to the solution of library problems.

The increased recognition that management alone cannot solve the library's problems have led to new concepts of managerial effectiveness. While personal leadership styles will continue to vary, managers are turning to their staffs for advice, counsel, and feedback on major decisions with increased frequency.

The central problem has been that most librarians are not formally trained as managers and inherit a legacy of traditional hierarchical management. This approach tends to subordinate the individual to mechanical roles and specialized functions and emphasizes the managerial role of control and close supervision of staff activities. But librarians are finding that traditional concepts of the managerial role are not successful in dealing with current situations and emerging demands. Staff expectations, the volatile relationships among staff, and the requirements for improved performance require library managers to experiment with new roles which lead to a process of influence and to integrating the dynamic variables of talented staff, clear goals, and limited resources. The effective manager coordinates

the efforts of hard-working staff doing complex and interrelated tasks, rather than doing the task themselves, directing others or specifying who does what, when. This manager is one who is able to tap the full potential of staff capabilities and to persuade staff to pursue library goals enthusiastically through an authentic and individual leadership style.

Administrators are accommodating behavioral dimensions in defining goals, providing incentives and opportunities for staff development, developing a climate for creativity and risk taking, and anticipating rather than fighting changes needed to adapt organizational policies to current reality. This role requires sound interpersonal communication and decision-making skills and has lead to more open organizations in which heirarchical levels are less rigidly defined and categorized.

III. PROGRAM ACTIVITIES OF THE ARL OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARY MANAGEMENT STUDIES (OMS) 1976

The issues discussed above have produced complex and difficult managerial challenges. In support of library managers facing these challenges, the Office operates an applied research and development program, an information collection and dissemination program and an organizational training program. The highlights of OMS program activities during 1976 are noted below.

A. THE OFFICE PROGRAM OF APPLIED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

This program includes OMS activities that identify library issues requiring study, develop means of dealing with library problems, and design management processes that will lead to overall library performance improvement. Current projects operated as developmental activities include: the Management Review and Analysis Program, the Academic Library Development Program, and the Collection Analysis Project.

1. The Management Review and Analysis Program (MRAP)

The OMS continues to make available the resources needed for this assisted self-study. During 1976, the OMS concluded the fourth application of the program with six participating libraries (Indiana, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania State, Toronto, and Utah) completing the study report and initiating implementation of the results. The completed reports are available from the Office, as is a list describing the status of earlier MRAP projects.

The fifth MRAP application operated during the year at the Johns Hopkins University Library. This application incorporated refinements in the process suggested by the

experiences of past participants. These changes included: modification of the procedure to emphasize the role of top management; identification of potential problems in the self-study and provision of consultative assistance to minimize the impact of these problems; and operation of on-site training sessions for the study team once a month. The study team completed the MRAP report in September and the Director of the Library initiated an implementation plan in December.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Library began participation in MRAP during September 1976 and is compensating ARL for costs involved in the program. The current schedule calls for this program to be completed by September, 1977.

2. The Academic Library Development Program (ALDP)

The Academic Library Development Program applies the OMS' experience in operating the Management Review and Analysis Program to the design and operation of a focused self-study procedure for small and mid-sized academic libraries. The ALDP is sponsored by the Council on Library Resources, Inc., and ARL has agreed to release up to 20 percent of the time of the OMS Director to assist in its development. Dr. Grady Morein has been retained by the Council to direct the ALDP. The University of North Carolina Library at Charlotte served as a pilot site to assist in the design of the program. During the year a draft procedure was designed; the pilot library worked through the procedure and produced a study report; plans were made for future testing of the procedure; and a working draft of the ALDP Manual was completed.

3. The Northeast Academic Science Information Center (NASIC)

NASIC was funded from 1973 to July 1976 by the National Science Foundation to promote the use of machine-based information services in academic libraries. OMS staff assisted in the conduct of field surveys, the development of reports, including an ARL Management Supplement (September 1974) reviewing current computer search activities in academic libraries, and operation of the advisory groups. During 1976 the Office issued an OMS Occasional Paper that provides guidelines for the introduction of on-line bibliographic search services in academic libraries, and OMS staff contributed to an article appearing in the Library Journal that reflects on some of the barriers to wider use of machine-based information services.

4. The Collection Analysis Project (CAP)

The Collection Analysis Project (CAP), which has attracted a $110,000 grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, represents a new interest of the OMS. The project grew out of earlier OMS work on a problem analysis procedure which was described in last year's annual report. The CAP is intended to apply the skills and resources of the OMS to the examination of existing policies and attitudes toward collection development in research libraries. The project will include field surveys and a SPEC survey to review current practices, the establishment of an advisory group to assist the Office, the design of a collections analysis procedure, a test of this procedure at three or four major libraries and an evaluation of the pilot tests to determine appropriate future actions. During 1976, OMS developed plans for CAP, completed initial site visits at four libraries and made preliminary plans for the project's Advisory Commitee.

5. Council On Library Resources, Inc. (CLR) Fellowship Study on the Use of Managerial and Technical Specialists in Research Libraries

Keith Cottam, from the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, completed his CLR fellowship on the use of managerial and technical specialists in research libraries during this year. His study, which was carried out at the OMS, culminated in the publication of an ARL Management Supplement entitled "Professional Specialists in Academic Libraries". The Supplement describes current practice in the utilization of personnel, automation, administrative and facilities specialists in academic and research libraries.

B. THE OFFICE PROGRAM OF INFORMATION COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION

The purpose of OMS activities in this area is to secure and make available information on research library practices which might stimulate improvement in research library operation and management. The program operates an information clearinghouse and also issues publications.

1. The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC)

The primary purpose of SPEC is to collect and distribute documentation on current practices of member libraries. The Center surveys member libraries, analyzes the documents that these libraries are willing to share, issues SPEC Flyers that report the survey results, and selects illustrative documents for inclusion in SPEC Kits. In 1976, the Center conducted surveys on gift and exchange activity in research libraries, on the systems function in research

libraries, and on the way financial pressures are dealt with through the budget allocation and control processes.

The SPEC Flyers and Kits issued during 1976 included:

- SPEC Flyer Number 24 on User Surveys was issued in February, 1976. The Flyer reports on techniques used by ARL libraries in gathering information concerning user assessment and utilization of library services. The Flyer looked at surveys as general evaluative tools, methods for conducting surveys, limitations of current approaches, and future directions and needs. The SPEC Kit on User Surveys provided examples of evaluative surveys, user profile surveys, interview guides, and research methodology.

- SPEC Flyer Number 25 on User Statistics and Studies was issued in March 1976. This Flyer examines statistical studies which are developed from information sources such as circulation data, methods used for ongoing data collection, and future needs and trends in this area. The SPEC Kit on User Statistics and Studies presents representative methods for collecting reference statistics, circulation statistics, and examples of formal statistical studies in the areas of materials availability, circulation, catalog use, space utilization, and design of statistical models.

- SPEC Flyer Number 26 on Bibliographic Access was issued in April 1976. The Flyer reports on the results of an earlier SPEC survey on User Services and discusses developments in bibliographic access provided through the card catalog, automated literature search services and other more specialized bibliographic access services. The SPEC Kit on Bibliographic Access includes two Figures compiled from data resulting from the SPEC User Services Survey--one listing new, eliminated and planned services in ARL libraries and the other describing the ways in which ARL libraries deal with users' obstacles to more efficient bibliographic access. Other types of documentation in the Kit include descriptions of catalog access, automated cataloging systems and automated literature search services.

- SPEC Flyer Number 27 on Physical Access was issued in June 1976 and describes research library services which facilitate the actual delivery of information sources to the user. The Flyer discusses automated circulation systems, borrowing privileges for non-campus users, use charges and utilization of circulation data in formulating service policies. Interlibrary

loan, book delivery and newer media services in ARL libraries are also described. The SPEC Kit on Physical Access includes such documentation as loan codes, descriptions of automated circulation systems and interlibrary loan systems, interlibrary loan policy statements, illustrations of book delivery services, and services for the physically handicapped.

- SPEC Flyer Number 28 on Gifts and Exchange Functions was distributed in August and reports the results of a survey conducted for the UCLA Libraries in the Spring of 1976. The Flyer discusses various organizational configurations of gifts and exchange functions and reports that there is some concern over the effectiveness of these operations in attracting gifts while limiting the receipt of less useful materials. The SPEC Kit on Gifts and Exchange Functions includes an analysis of the survey plus illustrative procedures used by libraries in operating the gifts and exchange function.

- SPEC Flyer Number 29, concerning the Systems Function in ARL libraries, was distributed in September and covered the current role and utilization of systems analysis in academic libraries, the contribution systems activities have made to library operations, and the organization of the systems function. Both the Systems Kit and Flyer on the Systems Function resulted from a survey conducted earlier in 1976. The Kit includes a report on the survey results, which describes the organization, staff and activities related to the systems function. The Kit also contains illustrations of the ways in which the systems function is applied in automation projects and in planning problem-solving activities, as well as several systems function position descriptions.

- SPEC Flyer Number 30, distributed in November, reports on research libraries' concerns associated with enhanced use of support staff and student assistants. The Flyer suggests that better use of these personnel frequently depends upon certain managerial and organizational factors, such as classification schemes, personnel policies and supervisory practices. The Kit on Support Staff and Student Assistants contains 17 documents including position descriptions, support staff performance evaluation materials, union contracts, and policy statements concerning these staff.

During the year the Center: responded to 2,908 requests for information, including 2,041 orders for SPEC Kits and 816 orders for other publications; maintained 131 SPEC subscriptions; provided one on-demand survey

for a member library; and maintained SPEC files for use by ARL members, SPEC subscribers, and individuals performing library research. In addition, 1,320 major publications were mailed to member libraries, and 3,080 copies of the SPEC Flyer were distributed to ARL library staff and directors.

2. Major OMS Publications Developed in 1976

- A review of current trends in the utilization of managerial and technical specialists was written by Keith M. Cottam as part of his CLR Fellowship and was published as ARL Management Supplement, Vol. 4, No. 1(June 1976), "Professional Specialists in Academic Libraries".

- Occasional Paper, Number Four, entitled "A Handbook for the Introduction of On-Line Bibliographic Search Services into Academic Libraries" was published by the Office in June 1976. Authored by David M. Wax, former director of the Northeast Academic Science Information Center (NASIC), this publication provides guidelines for resolving organizational, staffing and service issues in providing on-line search services in academic libraries.

- Staff Performance Evaluation Program at the McGill University Libraries was published this year and reported the results of a collaborative project of the Office and the McGill University Libraries. It includes a description of the design process, the program description of the McGill Libraries' goals-based performance evaluation process and the accompanying Supervisor's Manual.

C. THE OFFICE PROGRAM OF ORGANIZATIONAL TRAINING AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The purpose of activities within this program is to identify the training requirements of member libraries and to make available needed training resources. The OMS operates management workshops and institutes, assists in the research work of individuals, selects and makes available training films, works with individual libraries in operating specified training activities, and designs training programs. During 1976 the following activities made up the training program.

1. Management Skills Institutes

The Office operated three Management Skills Institutes during 1976. Each institute aimed at providing an intensive, personal learning event relating to skills needed to improve supervisory and managerial effectiveness. The

format of the institutes centered on identifying and specifying individual concerns and then, in a laboratory setting, providing resources that facilitate progress on the resolution of these concerns. The institutes have dealt with a range of issues, including:

- Establishing realistic goals and productivity measures
- Dealing with the impact of reduced budgets
- Introducing and maintaining change in the library
- Influencing the parent institution's administration
- Developing and evaluating individual performance
- Developing effective communication within the library

The first institute in 1976 was conducted at Airlie House in Virginia during August and was attended by 41 librarians. The second institute was held on the Stanford University campus in September and was attended by 39 west coast librarians. The third institute was conducted for Stanford University Library staff and 42 members of the libraries' supervisory and management staff participated. Evaluations of each institute were completed by participants and are available from the Office.

2. Training Project at McGill University Libraries

This is a developmental project operated by the OMS at the McGill University Libraries which resulted in a new staff performance appraisal program. The OMS assisted the Libraries in designing a process for preparing specific goals for each unit against which individual staff can relate performance. The Office also provided the supervisory training needed to implement the procedure. During the year, McGill staff operated the goal-setting and appraisal procedures and the Office issued a publication describing the program. Currently the program is being assessed by a staff committee at McGill.

3. Training Film Resources Program

The OMS screens and selects training films to make them available to member libraries maintaining in-house training programs. In addition, the Office designs training materials that facilitate the use of these films in libraries.

During 1976, over 50 films were screened and to date 6 films have been acquired and the supporting materials prepared. The three added during 1976 are:

- Take The Chair, which reviews the requirements for efficient committee operation and is concerned with preparing people to work in a committee setting.

- The Time Of Your Life, which portrays basic principles of time management and recommends improvements in the way supervisors plan their time.

- The Pgymalian Effect, which explores the concept that one person's expectations can influence the behavior of another and examines how managerial and supervisory behavior can shape staff performance.

This program is available to ARL libraries willing to share film acquisition costs. Twenty-four libraries have contributed $250 each to participate and the films have been used in 60 training programs,

4. Workshops

OMS staff regularly operate or participate in one or two-day workshops that are intended either to review OMS program activities or to provide an introduction to management concepts. During 1976, OMS staff participated in:

- An EDUCOM workshop that dealt with the economics of library operation in regard to financial pressures facing libraries, techniques for reducing costs, and hard decisions that need to be made by libraries in accommodating restricted financial resources.

- A CLENE Assembly which was planned and chaired by OMS staff and dealt with the theme of assessment in continuing education.

- A two-day management workshop which was conducted at the University of California at Santa Cruz and which was aimed at introducing selected management concepts to library staff.

- A Federal Library Committee Executive and Management Workshop which related contemporary management theory and practice to operational library situations.

- A conference on No-Growth Budgets and Implications for Academic Libraries held at the Indiana State University Libraries, Terre Haute, Indiana.

IV. OFFICE PRIORITIES FOR 1977

Organizations tend to resist change but both internal and external pressures affect the way libraries perform. To the degree that these pressures are operating, it is not so much a matter of whether libraries will change, but whether librarians will control and influence change or simply react to it as it occurs. Too often libraries are locked into a set of values, procedures and techniques that prevent them from comprehending contemporary organizational reality. More money, increased inter-institutional cooperation and cost effective computer systems will not solve all of the managerial problems facing libraries. To achieve dynamic organizations capable of solving today's problems and anticipating tomorrow's needs, libraries need to adopt a new set of perspectives. These new perspectives encompass an understanding of how people can be more successful in accomplishing work goals in library organizations, the inter-relationships that libraries have with their environment, and how to create adaptable organizations that are more open to change.

In the past year there was encouraging evidence of libraries' willingness to adopt strategies for change. The Office's MRAP is one example, with 23 member libraries completing the program and progressing on some of the issues noted earlier. In addition, libraries are redesigning organizational structures, introducing carefully planned supervisory training programs and adopting innovative communication processes. In many libraries, the task force approach to problem-solving is supplementing the traditional, heirarchically-based approach. But whatever the particular approach, the intention is to control change, to make it productive and stimulating, and to move away from crisis management. The approaches to change that have developed in libraries represent attempts to place the organization in a proactive rather than a reactive stance. The extent to which libraries can directly and vigorously manage their own future will determine the character and viability of research libraries.

The existence of the pressures for change noted earlier have influenced the priorities for future operation of the Office's basic programs of (1) Applied Research and Development, (2) Information Collection and Dissemination, and (3) Training.

In the research and development area, the Management Review and Analysis Program (MRAP), an assisted self-study process will be made available to interested libraries. During 1977, MRAP will be applied by a non-member, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Library, which is paying for program materials. In addition, two ARL Libraries are seriously considering the program for the fall. A separate study, funded by the Council on Library Resources, will attempt to assess the impact MRAP has had at participating libraries. This study is being carried out by Edward Johnson, a librarian, and Stuart Mann, a faculty member in operations research at Pennsylvania State University.

The Academic Library Development Program (ALDP), which draws on the MRAP experience, is a focused self-study for small and mid-sized libraries. It has been supported by the Council on Library Resources, and the Office provided assistance in operating the pilot study during 1976. The Council is supporting further testing of the ALDP procedure at three or four libraries during 1977 and the Office will continue to provide assistance in this effort.

In addition to these research and development projects, the OMS will make a major investment in the Collection Analysis Project which is concerned with the management of collections in research libraries. Funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, this project will study the materials selection, acquisition, retention, and preservation policies of research libraries. The project's products will be analytical procedures aimed at helping libraries assess both their present collections and more importantly, their collection development policies and procedures. The OMS expects to complete the initial stages of this project during 1977.

In the area of information collection and dissemination the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) is the Office's principal activity. Results of a survey on budgeting processes will be reported in early 1977. Additional surveys are planned on security and management of the library's physical plant, and collection development and preservation policies and procedures. The main priority in this program area will continue to be maintenance of the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center, since SPEC is one of the most widely used of all services provided by the Office, with almost every member library contributing to and taking advantage of SPEC materials.

The third major program operated by the OMS involves organizational training for staff of research libraries. The Office has scheduled its fourth Management Skills Institute for April 1977 in Kansas City, Missouri and has tentative plans for a fifth institute in the Washington area later in the year. The Management Training Film Program will be continued with additional films made available. The OMS is recruiting a new staff member to serve as a full time training program coordinator who will focus on developing and making available training modules for in-house training programs at member libraries.

The ARL Management Commission has acted as principal advisor to the Office in the past but the recent abolition of Association Commissions has led to the recommendation of a separate group to work with the Office and Association staff in determining future directions. The new group will be made up of library and university administrators. The ARL Board has approved a charge defining the role and composition of the new group and the initial meetings of the group are planned for 1977.

The Association continues to rely on the Council of Library Resources for primary support in operating the Office of University Library Management Studies. This year will be the second year on the current grant which calls for sharing of operating costs among membership dues, the CLR grant, and cost recovery activities such as sale of publications and services.

Submitted by:

Duane E. Webster
Director

Approved by:

John G. Lorenz
Executive Director

Jeffrey J. Gardner
Management Research Specialist

Nancy I. Zeidner
SPEC Coordinator

ATTACHMENT I: BIBLIOGRAPHY OF OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARY MANAGEMENT STUDIES PUBLICATIONS AND DOCUMENTATION IN 1976

Association of Research Libraries, Office of University Library Management Studies. Management Training Film Program. "Training Package for Film: Take the Chair." Washington, D.C.: Author, 1976. 23 pp.*

_____. Management Training Film Program. " Training Package for Film: The Time of Your Life." Washington, D.C.: Author, 1976. 20 pp.*

_____. SPEC Kits and Flyers No.'s 24-30. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1976.

Kits:
"User Surveys." No. 24. February, 1976. 116 pp.
"User Statistics and Studies." No. 25. March, 1976. 164 pp.
"Bibliographic Access." No. 26. April, 1976. 180 pp.
"Physical Access." No. 27. June, 1976. 142 pp.
"Gifts and Exchange Functions." No. 28. August, 1976. 129
"Systems Function." No. 29. September, 1976. 103 pp.
"Support Staff and Student Assistants." No. 30. November, 1976. 109 pp.

Association of Research Libraries, Office of University Library Management Studies and McGill University Libraries. "Staff Performance Evaluation Program at the McGill University Libraries: A Program Description of a Goals-Based Performance Evaluation Process with Accompanying Supervisor's Manual." Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, Office of University Library Management Studies, 1976.

Cottam, Keith M. "Professional Specialists in Academic Libraries." ARL Management Supplement, Vol. 4, No. 1 Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, Office of University Library Management Studies, 1976.

Gardner, Jeffrey J. and Wax, David M. "Online Bibliographic Services." Library Journal, Vol. 101, No. 16 (September 15, 1976): 1827-32.

Gardner, Jeffrey J., and Webster, Duane E. "Library Management." In ALA Yearbook: A Review of Events 1975. Chicago: American Library Association, 1976. pp. 226-31.

University of Kentucky Libraries. Report of the Management Review and Analysis of the University of Kentucky Libraries. June, 1976.**

University of Massachusetts, Amherst. A Management Review and Analysis of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst Libraries. July, 1976.

University of Toronto Library. Report of the Management Review and Analysis Program at the University of Toronto Library. June, 1976, plus appendices.

Wax, David M. "A Handbook for the Introduction of On-Line Bibliographic Search Services into Academic Libraries." Office of University Library Management Studies Occasional Paper. No. 4. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, Office of University Library Management Studies, June, 1976.

Webster, Duane E. "Development and Use of the Management Review and Analysis Program." In "The Management Review and Analysis Program: A Symposium." Journal of Academic Librarianship 1 (January, 1976): 4-14.

Webster, Duane E. and Gardner, Jeffrey J. "Strategies for Academic Library Management." In We Can Implement Cost-Effective Information Now, Proceedings EDUCOM Spring Conference, University of Louisville, April 7-9, 1976. Princeton: EDUCOM, 1976. 81-94.

Webster, Duane E. and Zeidner, Nancy I. "Personnel and Employment: Staff Development." In ALA Yearbook: A Review of Events 1975. Chicago: American Library Association, 1976. 263-65.

*Training film program materials available to participating ARL libraries
**Available from the OMS

APPENDIX D

ATTENDANCE AT 89TH MEETING

University of Alabama Libraries
James F. Wyatt

University of Alberta Library
Bruce Peel

University of Arizona Library
W. Daivd Laird

Arizona State University Library
Donald Koepp

Boston Public Library
Philip J. McNiff

Boston Universtiy Library
John Laucus

Brigham Young University Library
Donald K. Nelson

University of British Columbia Library
Basil Stuart-Stubbs

Brown University Library
Charles Churchwell

University of California Library
(Berkeley) Richard Dougherty

University of California Library
(Davis) Bernard Kreissman

University of California Library
(Los Angeles) Page Ackerman

University of California Library
(San Diego) John Haak

University of California Library
(Santa Barbara) Donald Davidson

Case Western Reserve Unviersity Libraries
James V. Jones

Center for Research Libraries
Gordon R. Williams

Univeristy of Chicago Library
Stanley McElderry

Univeristy of Colorado Library
Leo Cabell

Colorado State University Library
Lee Moyen W. Anderson

Columbia University Libraries
Warren J. Haas

University of Connecticut Library
John P. McDonald

Cornell University Libraries
J. Gormly Miller

Dartmouth College Libraries
Edward C. Lathem

Duke University Libraries
Connie R. Dunlap

Emory University Libraries
Paul Cousins, Jr.

University of Florida Libraries
Gustave A. Harrer

Florida State Unviersity Library
Charles Miller

Georgetown University Library
Joseph E. Jeffs

University of Georgia Libraries
Warren N. Boes

Harvard University LIbrary
Douglas W. Bryant

Univeristy of Hawaii Library
Stanley L. West

University of Houston Libraries
Robert V. Haynes

Howard Unviersity Libraries
Binford H. Conley

University of Illinois Library
Hugh Atkinson

Indiana University Libraries
W. Carl Jackson

University of Iowa Libraries
Leslie W. Dunlap

John Crerar Library
William Budington

Johns Hopkins University Library
David Stam

Joint University Libraries
Frank P. Grisham

University of Kansas Library
James Ranz

Universtiy of Kentucky Libraries
Paul A. Willis

Kent State University Libraries
Hyman W. Kritzer

Library of Congress
Daniel J. Boorstin

Louisiana State University Library
Goerge Guidry, Jr.

University of Maryland Library
H. Joanne Harrar

Massachusetts Institute of
Technology Libraries
Jay K. Lucker

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Siegfried Feller

McGill University Library
(Montreal) Marianne Scott

McMaster University Library
(Ontario) William Ready

University of Miami Library
(Florida) Archie L. McNeal

University of Michigan Library
Robin Downes

Michigan State University Library
Richard Chapin

University of Minnesota Libraries
Raymond A. Bohling

National Agricultural Library
Richard A. Farley

University of Nebraska Libraries
Gerald A. Rudolph

New York Public Library
James Henderson

University of North Carolina Libraries
James F. Govan

Northwestern Unviersity Libraries
John P. McGowan

University of Notre Dame Libraries
David E. Sparks

Ohio State University Libraries
Betty Meyer

Oklahoma State University Library
Rosco Rouse

University of Oregon Library
H. William Axford

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Richard De Gennaro

Pennsylvania State University Library
Stuart Forth

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Oxanna Kaufman

Princeton University Library
Richard Boss

Purdue University Library
Joseph M. Dagnese

Queen's University
Donald Redmond

Rice University Library
Ricahrd L. O'Keeffe

University of Rochester Libraries
Margaret Perry

Rutgers University Library
Virginia P. Whitney

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Russell Shank

Southern Illinois University Library
Kenneth G. Peterson

Stanford University Libraries
David C. Weber

State University of New York at Albany
C. James Schmidt

State University of New York at Buffalo
Eldred Smith

State University of New York at Stony Brook
John B. Smith

Syracuse University Libraries
Donald Anthony

Temple University Library
Joseph Nitecki

University of Tennessee Libraries
Donald R. Hunt

University of Texas Libraries
Harold Billings

Texas A & M University Library
Henry Alsmeyer

University of Toronto Libraries
Robert Blackburn

Tulane University Library
John H. Gribbin

University of Utah Libraries
Robert Runyon

Virginia Polytechnic Inst. & State Unv
H. Gordon Bechanan

University of Virginia Libraries
Ray Frantz, Jr.

University of Washington Library
(Seattle) Kenneth Allen

Washington State University Library
(Pullman) Allen F. Schnaitter

Washington University Libraries
David Zubatsky

Wayne University Libraries
Vern M. Pings

University of Western Ontario
(Canada) Robert Lee

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr.

Yale University Libraries
Rutherford D. Rogers

Guests

Calvin Boyer, University of Mississippi
Thomas Buckman, The Foundation Center
Fred Cole, Council on Library Resource
George Farr, National Endowment for the Human.
Paul Janaske, U.S. Office of Education
Ruth Kirk, University of Washington, Seattle
Herman Liebaers, Royal Library, Brussels
Beverly P. Lynch, Association of College and Research Libraries
Stephen McCarthy, Annapolis
Gordon Ray, Guggenheim Memorial Foundation
James Skipper, Research Libraries GRoup
Elaine Sloan, Smithsonian Institute
Carl Spaulding, Council on Library Resources
David Watkins, Brandies University
Christopher Wright, Library of Congress
Louis Wright

ARL Staff:

John G. Lorenz, Executive Director
Suzanne Frankie, Assistant Executive Director
James Beattie, ARL Research Specialist
Duane E. Webster, Director, Office of University Library Management Studies
Jeffrey Gardner, Management Research Specialist
P.K. Yu, Director, Center for Chinese Research Materials

ATTENDANCE BY THE MEMBERSHIP - NAME INDEX

Ackerman, Page	University of California Library, Los Angeles
Allen, Kenneth	University of Washington Library, Seattle
Alsmeyer, Henry	Texas A & M University Library
Anderson, Lee Moyen W.	Colorado State University Library
Anthony, Donald	Syracuse University Library
Atkinson, Hugh	University of Illinois Library
Axford, William H.	University of Oregon Library
Bechanan, Gordon H.	Virginia Polytechnic Intst. & State Univ.
Billings, Harold	University of Texas Libraries
Blackburn, Robert	University of Toronto Libraries
Boes, Warren N.	University of Georgia Libraries
Bohling, Raymond A.	University of Minnesota Libraries
Boorstin, Daniel J.	Library of Congress
Boss, Richard	Princeton University Library
Bryant, Douglas W.	Harvard University Library
Budington, William	John Crerar Library
Cabell, Leo	University of Colorado Library
Chapin, Richard	Michigan State University Library
Churchwell, Charles	Brown University Library
Conley, Binford H.	Howard University Libraries
Cousins, Paul, Jr.	Emory University Libraries
Dagnese, Joseph M.	Purdue University Library
Davidson, Donald	University of California Library, Santa Barbara
Dougherty, Richard	Unviersity of California Library, Berkley
Downes, Robin	University of Michigan Library
Dunlap, Connie R.	Duke University Libraries
Dunlap, Leslie W.	University of Iowa Libraries
Farley, Richard A.	National Agricultural Library
Feller, Siegfrid	University of Massachusetts Libraries
Forth, Stuart	Pennsylvania State University Library
Frantz, Ray, Jr.	University of Virginia Library
Gennaro, Richard De	University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Govan, James F.	University of North Carolina Libraries
Gribbin, John G.	Tulane University Library
Grisham, Frank P.	Joint University Libraries
Guidry, George, Jr.	Louisiana State University Library

Haak, John	University of California Library, San Diego
Haas, Warren J.	Columbia University Libraries
Harrar, Joanne H.	University of Maryland Library
Farrer, Gustave A.	University of Florida Libraries
Haynes, Robert V.	University of Houston Library
Henderson, James	New York Public Library
Hunt, Donald R.	University of Tennessee Libraries
Jackson, Carl W.	Indiana University Libraries
Jeffs, Joseph E.	Georgetown University Library
Jones, James V.	Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Kaufman, Oxanne	University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Koepp, Donald	Arizona State University Library
Kreissman, Bernard	University of California Library, Davis
Kritzer, Hyman W.	Kent State University Libraries
Laird, David W.	University of Arizona Library
Lathem, Edward C.	Dartmouth College Libraries
Laucus, John	Boston University Library
Lee, Robert	University of Western Ontario, Canada
Lucker, Jay K.	Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries
McDonald, John P.	University of Connecticut Library
McElderry, Stanley	University of Chicago Library
McGowan, John P.	Northwestern University Libraries
McNeal, Archie L.	University of Miami Library
McNiff, Philip J.	Boston Public Library
Meyer, Betty	Ohio State University Libraries
Miller, Charles	Florida State University Library
Miller, Gormly J.	Cornell University Libraries
Nelson, Donald K.	Brigham Young University Library
Nitecki, Joseph	Temple University Library
O'Keefe, Richard L.	Rice University Library
Peel, Bruce	University of Alberta Library
Perry, Margaret	University of Rochester Libraries
Peterson, Kenneth G.	Southern Illinois University Library
Pings, Vern M.	Wayne University Libraries

Ranz, James	University of Kansas Library
Ready, William	McMaster University Library
Redmond, Donald	Queen's University
Rogers, Rugherford D.	Yale University Libraries
Rouse, Rosco	Okalahoma State University Library
Rudolph, Gerald A.	University of Nebraska Libraries
Runyon, Robert	University of Utah Libraries
Schmidt, James C.	State University of N.Y. at Albany
Schnaitter, Allen F.	Washington State University Library
Scott, Marianne	McGill University Library
Shank, Russell	Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Smith, Eldred	State University of N.Y. at Buffalo
Smith, John B.	State University of N.Y. at Stony Brook
Sparks, David E.	University of Notre Dame Libraries
Stam, David	Johns Hopkins University Library
Stuart-Stubbs, Basil	University of British Columbia Library
Tyeyz, Joseph H., Jr.	University of Wisconsin Libraries
Weber, David C.	Stanford University Libraries
West, Stanley L.	University of Hawii Library
Whitney. Virginia P.	Rutgers University Library
Williams, Gordon R.	Center for Research Libraries
Willis, Paul A.	University of Kentucky Libraries
Wyatt, James F.	University of Alabama Libraries
Zubatsky, David	Washington University Libraries

APPENDIX E

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
OFFICERS, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES

October 1976

ARL OFFICERS AND BOARD FOR 1976

Virginia P. Whitney, President
Edward C. Lathem, Vice President & President-elect
Richard De Gennaro, Past President
Page Ackerman (Oct. 1976)
Richard Boss (Oct. 1977)
Richard A. Farley (Oct.. 1978)
Ray Frantz, Jr. (Oct. 1978)
Gustave A. Harrer (Oct. 1976)
Richard O'Keeffe (Octo. 1976)
Russell Shank (Oct. 1977)
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr. (Oct. 1978)

ARL STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on Access to Manuscripts and Rare Books

William Bond
William Cagle
John Finzi
Leslie Dunlap
Ray Frantz, Jr., Chairman
C. Herbert Finch

Committee on Center for Chinese Research Materials

Roy Hofheinz, Jr.
Ying-mao Kau
David T. Roy
Weiying Wan
Eugene Wu
Philip McNiff, Chairman

Committee on Foreign Newspapers on Microfilm

Gustave Harrer
Bruce Peel
Gordon Williams

Committee on Interlibrary Loan

H. Gordon Bechanan (1978)
Richard Boss (1978)
Richard E. Chapin (1977)
John Humphrey (1977)
Ruth Kirk (1977)
David Weber (1978)
Jay Lucker Chairman (1978)

National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging Liaison Committee

Philip McNiff
Howard Sullivan
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr.
Frederick Wagman, Chairman

ARL/CRL Joint Committee for a National Periodicals Lending Library

Richard De Gennaro, Vice Chairman
Arthur Hamlin
Warren Haas
John G. Lorenz
William Welsh
Virginia P. Whitney
Gordon Williams
Robert Wessel
Douglas W. Bryant, Chairman

Committee on Nominations

Douglas W. Bryant
Frederick H. Wagman
Edward C. Lathem, Chairman

Committee on Preservation of Research Libraries Materials

David Stam, Chairman
Gustave Harrer
Joanne Harrar

ARL/ACRL Joint Committee on University Library Standards

Calvin Boyer
William Kurth
Stanley McElderry
Richard Talbot
Melvin Voigt
David Watkins
Eldred Smith, Chairman

ARL SUBCOMMITTEES

Subcommittee to Review the Criteria for Membership in ARL

Gustave A. Harrer
Stanley McElderry
Page Ackerman, Chairman

ARL COMMITTEES ON FOREIGN ACQUISITIONS

Africa

Peter Duignan, Hoover Institution on War, Peace and Revolution
J.M.C. Crossey, Yale University
Esther J. Walls, SUNY Stony Brook
Julian Witherell, Library of Congress
Hans Panofsky, Northwestern University, Chairman

Middle East

George N. Atiyeh, Library of Congress
James Pollack, University of Indiana
David H. Partington, Harvard University, Chairman

Eastern Europe

Joseph A. Placek, University of Michigan
Paul Horecky, Library of Congress
Marion Milczewski, University of Washington, Chairman

East Asia

Weying Wan, University of Mighigan
Eugene Wu, Harvard University
Warren Tsuneishi, Library of Congress, Chairman

South Asia

Richard De Gennaro, University of Pennsylvania
Paul Fasana, New York Public Library
Maureen Patterson, University of Chicago
Louis A. Jacob, Library of Congress, Chairman

Southeast Asia

Charles Bryant, Yale University
John Musgrave, University of Michigan

Latin America

Nettie Lee Benson, University of Texas
Donald Wisdom, Library of Congress
Carl W. Deal, University of Illinois, Chairman

Western Europe

Norman Dudley, University of California - Los Angeles
Ten-Tsai Feng, Boston Public Library
William H. Kurth, Washington University - St. Louis
Howard Sullivan, Wayne State University, Chairman

ARL TASK FORCES

Task Force on Criteria for Nonuniversity Membership in ARL

Ben Bowman
John Gribbin
Philip McNiff
William Budington, Chairman

Task Force on NEH Research Tools Program

Richard Dougherty
James Henderson
Hyman W. Kritzer
W. David Laird
David Sparks
W. David Laird, Chairman

Task Force on National Library Network Development

Hugh Atkinson
Dick De Gennaro
John Gribbin
Basil Stuart-Stubbs
William Welsh
Richard Dougherty, Chairman

REPRESENTATIVES

ANSI Committee Z-39.....John Lorenz
CONSER Project .....Rayburn Ross
Joint Committee on Union List of Serials .....William Budington
Joint Statistics Coordinating Committee (ALA) .....Donald Koepp
United States Book Exchange .....Joanne Harrar
Special Libraries Association .....Jospeh M. Dagnese

APPENDIX F

MEMBERSHIP OF ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

OCTOBER 1976

University of Alabama Libraries
P.O. Box S
University, Alabama 35486
James F. Wyatt, Dean of Libraries
(205) 348-5298

University of Alberta Library
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
Bruce Peel, Director
(403) 432-3790

University of Arizona Library
Tucson, Arizona 85721
W. David Laird, Librarian
(602) 884-2101

Arizona State University Library
Tempe, Arizona 85281
Donald Koepp, Librarian
(602) 965-3415

Boston Public Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02117
Philip J. McNiff, Librarian
(617) 536-5400

Boston University Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
John Laucus, Director
(617) 353-3710

Brigham Young University
324 Lee Library
Provo, Utah 84602
Donald K. Nelson, Director
(801) 374-1211 Ext. 2905

University of British Columbia Library
Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T 1W5
Basil Stuart-Stubbs, Librarian
(604) 228-2298

Brown University Library
Providence, Rhode Island 02912
Charles Churchwell, Librarian
(401) 863-2162

University of California Library
Berkeley, California 94720
Richard Dougherty, Librarian
(415) 642-3773

University of California Library
Davis, California 95616
Bernard Kreissman, Librarian
(916) 752-2110

University of California Library
Los Angeles, California 90024
Page Ackerman, Librarian
(213) 825-1201

University of California, San Diego
The University Library
La Jolla, California 92093
John Haak, Acting Director
(714) 452-3061

University of California, Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, California 93106
Donald Davidson, Librarian
(805) 961-3256

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Cleveland, Ohio 55106
James V. Jones, Director
(216) 368-2990

Center for Research Libraries
5721 Cottage Grove Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Gordon R. Williams, Director
(312) 955-4545

University of Chicago Library
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Stanley McElderry, Director
(312) 753-2933

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221
Harold Schell, Dean, Library Admin &
Director of Libraries (513) 475-2533

University of Colorado Library
Boulder, Colorado 80304
Leo Cabell, Acting Director
(303) 492-6144

Colorado State University Library
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521
Le Moyne W. Anderson, Director
(303) 491-5911

Columbia University Libraries
New York, New York 10027
Warren J. Haas, Vice President & Libn.
(212) 280-2247

University of Connecticut Library
Storrs, Connecticut 06268
John P. McDonald, Director
(203) 486-2219

Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York 14850
J. Gormly Miller, Director
(607) 256-3689

Dartmouth College Libraries
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755
Edward C. Lathem, Librarian
(603) 646-2236

Duke University Libraries
Durham, North Carolina 27706
Connie R. Dunlap, Librarian
(919) 684-2034

Emory University Library
Atlanta, Georgia 30322
Don L. Bosseau, Director
(404) 329-6861

University of Florida Libraries
Gainesville, Florida 32603
Gustave A. Harrer, Director
(904) 392-0341

Florida State University Library
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
Charles Miller, Director
(904) 644-5211

Georgetown University Library
Washington, D.C. 20007
Joseph E. Jeffs, Director
(202) 625-4095

University of Georgia Libraries
Athens, Georgia 30601
Warren N. Boes, Director
(404) 542-2716

Harvard University Library
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Douglas W. Bryant, Director
(617) 495-2401

University of Hawaii Library
2550 The Mall
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
Stanley L. West, University Libn.
(808) 958-7205

University of Houston Libraries
Houston, Texas 77004
Robert V. Haynes, Interm Director
of Libraries, (713) 749-2340

Howard University Libraries
Washington, D.C. 20001
Binford H. Conley, Director
(202) 636-7234

University of Illinois Library
Urbana, Illinois 61801
Hugh Atkinson, Director
(217) 333-0790

Indiana University Libraries
Bloomington, Indiana 47405
W. Carl Jackson, Dean of Libraries
(812) 337-3404

University of Iowa Libraries
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
Leslie W. Dunlap, Dean of Library Admin.
(319) 353-4450

Iowa State Unviersity Library
Ames, Iowa 50011
Warren Kuhn, Dean of Lib. Services
(515) 294-1442

John Crerar Library
Chicago, Illinois 60616
William S. Budington, Director
(312) 225-2526

Johns Hopkins University Library
The Milton S. Eisenhower Library
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
David Stam, Librarian
(301) 338-8325

Joint University Libraries
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
Frank P. Grisham, Director
(615) 322-2834

University of Kansas Library
Lawrence, Kansas 66044
James Ranz, Dean of Libraries
(913) 864-3601

University of Kentucky Libraries
Lexington, Kentucky 40506
Paul Willis, Director
(606) 257-3801

Kent State University Libraries
Kent, Ohio 44242
Hyman W. Kritzer, Assistant Provost & Director of Libraries (216) 672-2962

Library of Congress
Washington, D.C. 20540
Daniel J. Boorstin, Librarian
(202) 426-5205

Linda Hall Library
Kansas City, Missouri 64110
Thomas D. Gillies, Director
(816) 363-4600

Louisiana State University Library
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
George Guidry, Jr., Director
(504) 388-3969

McGill University Library
Montreal, P.Q., Canada H3C 3G1
Marianne Scott, Director
(514) 392-4949

McMaster University
1280 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada L85 4L6
William Ready, University Librarian
(416) 525-9140 Local 4781

University of Maryland Library
College Park, Maryland 20742
H. Joanne Harrar, Librarian
(301) 454-3011

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002
Richard J. Talbot, Director
(413) 545-0284

Massachusetts Institute of Techn. Libs.
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
Jay Lucker, Director
(617) 253-5651

University of Miami Library
P.O. Box 248214
Coral Gables, Florida 33124
Archie L. McNeal, Director
(305) 284-3551

University of Michigan Library
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
Frederick H. Wagman, Director
(313) 764-9356

Michigan State University Library
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
Richard Chapin, Librarian
(517) 355-2341

University of Minnesota Libraries
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Raymond Bohling, Acting Director
(612) 373-3097

University of Missouri Library
Columbia, Missouri 65201
John Gribbin, Director
(314) 882-2739

National Agricultural Library
Beltsville, Maryland 20705
Richard A. Farly, Director
(301) 344-3779

National Library of Canada
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ont., Canada K1A 0N4
Joseph Guy Sylvestre, Librarian
(613) 992-0401

National Library of Medicine
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
Martin M. Cummings, Director
(301) 496-6221

University of Nebraska Libraries
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
Gerald A. Rudolph, Dean of Libraries
(402) 472-7211

New York Public Library
New York, New York 10018
Richard W. Couper, President
(212) 695-3231

New York State Library
State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224
John A. Humphry, Asst. Commissioner
for Libraries (518) 474-5930

New York University Libraries
New York, New York 10003
Carlton C. Rochell, Dean of Libraries
(212) 598-2140

University of North Carolina Libraries
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27515
James F. Govan, Director
(919) 933-1301

Northwestern Unviersity Libraries
Evanston, Illinois 60210
John P. McGowan, Librarian
(312) 492-7640

University of Notre Dame Libraries
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
David E. Sparks, Director
(219) 283-7317

Ohio State University Libraries
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Betty J. Meyer, Acting Director
(614) 422-6152

University of Oklahoma Library
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
James K. Zink, Director
(405) 325-2611 or 2614

Oklahoma State University Library
Stillwater, Okalahoma 74075
Roscoe Rouse, Librarian
(405) 624-6321

University of Oregon Library
Eugene, Oregon 97403
H. William Axford, Univ. Librarian
(503) 686-3056

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19174
Richard De Gennaro, Director
(215) 243-7091

Pennsylvania State University Library
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
Stuart Forth, Dean of Univ. Libraries
(814) 865-0401

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260
Glenora Edwards Rossell, Director
(412) 624-4401

Princeton Unviersity Library
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
Richard Boss, Librarian
(609) 452-3190

Purdue University Library
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
Joseph M. Dagnese, Director
(317) 749-2571

Queen's University
Douglas Library
Kingston, Canada K7L 5C4
Donald A. Redmond, Chief Librarian
(613) 547-5950

Rice University Library
6100 S. Main
Box 1892
Houston, Texas 77001
Richard L. O'Keeffe, Librarian
(713) 527-4022

University of Rochester Libraries
Rochester, New York 14627
Margaret Perry, Acting Director
(716) 275-4463

Rutgers University Library
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
Virginia P. Whitney, Librarian
(201) 932-7505

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Constitution Avenue at Tenth St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20560
Russell Shank, Director
(202) 381-5496

University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208
Kenneth E. Toombs, Director of Libs.
(803) 777-3142

University of Soutehrn California Lib.
Los Angeles, California 90007
Roy L. Kidman, Librarian
(213) 746-2543

Southern Illinois Universtiy Library
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
Kenneth G. Peterson, Dean of Lib. Aff.
(618) 543-2522

Stanford University Libraries
Stanford, California 94305
David C. Weber, Director
(415) 497-2016

State University of New York at Albany
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222
C. James Schmidt, Director
(518) 457-8540

State Universtiy of New York at Buffalo
Libraries
Buffalo, New York 14214
Eldred Smith, Director
(716) 831-4216

State University of New York at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, New York 11790
John B. Smith Director & Dean of Library
(516) 246-5650

Syracuse University Libraries
Syracuse, New York 13210
Donald Anthony, Director
(315) 423-2574

Temple University Library
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
Arthur Hamlin, Director
(215) 787-8231

University of Tennessee Libraries
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Donald R. Hunt, Director
(615) 974-4127

University of Texas Libraries
Austin, Texas 78712
Merle N. Boylan, Director
(512) 471-3561

Texas A & M University Library
College Station, Texas 77843
Irene B. Hoadley, Director
(713) 845-6111

University of Toronto Libraries
Toronto, Ont., Canada M5S 1A5
Robert Blackburn, Director
(416) 978-2292

Tulane Universtiy Library
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118
John H. Gribbin, Director
(504) 865-5131

University of Utah Libraries
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
Roger Hanson, Director
(801) 581-8558

Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
H. Gordon Bechanan, Director
of Libraries
(703) 951-5593

University of Virginia Libraries
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903
Ray Frantz, Jr., Librarian
(804) 924-3026

University of Washington Library
Seattle, Washington 98105
Marion A. Milczewski, Director
(206) 543-1760

Washington State Universtiy Library
Pullman, Washington 99163
Dr. Allen F. Schnaitter, Director
(509) 335-4557

Washington University Libraries
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
William Kurth, Librarian
(314) 863-0100 Ext. 4523

Wayne State Unviersity Libraries
Detorit, Michigan 48202
Vern M. Pings, Director
(313) 577-4020

University of Western Ontario
London 72, Canada
Dr. Robert Lee, Director of
Libraries
(519) 629-3165

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr., Director
(608) 262-3521

Yale Universtiy Libraries
New Haven, Connecticut 06520
Rutherford D. Rogers, Librarian
(203) 436-2456